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## PREFACE.

IN laying before the Public a fourth Work not less elaborate than any of those in which he has been previously engaged, the Author feels that the approbation with which his former labours have been received may well remove from his mind much of that anxiety, which he would otherwise have felt as to the reception of the present.

It is obviously proper, in sending forth a new Edition of the New Testament, as it would be in editing any other antient writings, as well to point out to the reader the principal deficiencies, which such Edition is intended to supply, as to state the particular purposes which it is intended to answer.

As far as regards the Text of the New Testament, the Editor is not disposed to deny, that amongst the various Editions hitherto published, sufficient evidence is afforded to enable any person competently imbued with Learning and Criticism to ascertain the true reading. Yet what are called the Standard Texts differ considerably; especially that of Griesbach and Knapp, as compared with the textus receptus, and even with that of Matthæi, or of Scholz. And it is not to be supposed that Students, or indeed readers of the New Testament in general, have at command all the chief Standard Texts, or ordinarily possess the ability to decide between their diversities. It, therefore, seemed desirable that such persons should be supplied with a Text so constructed, that the variations from the textus receptus should be distinctly marked in the Text itself; and, as much as possible, not left to be learned from the Notes; and further, that the state of the evidence, in all important cases, should be laid before the reader, together with the reasons which induced the Editor to adopt any variation from the textus receptus; so that the

Staydent might thanee learn tor judge for, himself: for as Senech justly observes; "longum iter est per pracaepta, breve et efficay per exemapla,", But n new recension of the text formed on this plan, however desirable, and even necessery, was not to , be found in it this countrys nor, indeed, in aay other, based on sound pripetpleq: of Griticism: the Texts for:Aeademical and general uso being little more than reprinty of that, of Grieabach, of which the imperfectione (as will appear from what is a faid in these pagess; and in the course of the following wark) ope very considerable 1

And if thus great was, the: want of a Tent, fitted farstucki useq, how muck greater was that of a a consiqtent and suitable body of if imgatation! : The garliest, modert Commontavies, on the New: Terstamant were little more than, uncomnected Scholia on passages whemet thete:seemed a " "! dignus vindice nodus.": And no wandert: sipae (thay swefta formed, chiefly on the model of the Scholiants eat the Chassical writess; whoe labours, at the pevival of literature, whet the oply ${ }^{\text {a }}$ aid, to the underatanding of those writings. This mathod was, insmany; respects, convenient ta the earlier Commen.
 salleds imparpettall Gammentany; proposed merely to explain on illugtrate such prigits, as eapecialy neneded, it, and, such as theys
 which thafy ehowe to diocuss, were made nather the means:of: dimet playdngthein own leapning or neading; than of explaining the semper of iftheir authons. Indeed, evan those, Theologians who moet suct casefally equltivated this branch of learning (as Vadla, Vatablyay: Intbers Galvin, Beta, Erasmus, Strigelius, Lucas Brugensis, Zöd genessindrueitus, Caatalio, Scaliger, Casaubon, Capellus, Grotiuss: Conaftopnand Pricequs) and who in general interpreted the New Trestampentia a Grammatical and Gritical manner, without introducn: ingodotringh discussions, fell, in different degrees, into the ertor cof onlyoprphaiging what it was convenlent for them to explabia, mandy did not aim at forming a regular Commentary. This isysitem, (if, syatone it may be colled, continued to a late peribdy atud viday biev traced pare-or less, in almost all the Commentatorse of wherseyesary


Tow exceptions, but in these oaser the Commentaries'were extended to so immoderate in lenguly 'effectually wo preclude their being roud " "and to this' day they are "only used 'for referemee." The wer saine error was comnitted, though by' $k$ different procests, towards the close of 'the 'seventeenth century, by Cocceias' and others of his School, as 'Lampe, Westelius', and 'nany Datch Theologians; in whose hands the Anabytieal method became as pemaiotrs and trafavourable to the diseovery of itruth; as bad been the Eegical' and Grammatical in the hands of Crellius, sobliting, and others of that School; in whose Writings may be ehnoovared the very same abusk; from excess; of what is'god int iteef, as that which is "justly complained of ! in the 'Heterbdors clats of the Foreigh Expositors of the present age. The Com mentaries of our own countrymeny daring the seventeenth century; (though masterly in themselves, and of perpetual importance) para tase of the same fanit as those of Grotius and others in the Critit Smeri, in being too prolix and desultory in somes patts, whernt satisfactority brief in others; no approach being'wade to any"thiag' like a connected Commentary: This state of thrings talso long contimued; and the first attempt at any thing Hike aregolat athet connected Gratnmatical Commentary formed wo be tetad thetought; and not to be used for reference only; -for Acadetrical and gehetiot usej and not for that of the leanned only;

 coppious' philological and eregetical mmotations, 'serving to (estou blish the literal and graminatictad senve; all doetrinal dibculssiond being excladed." The learned Editor only lived to publish owor Vodumes, containing the Epistles to the Romans, Galatians;' Ephe」 sians, and Thessalomians $;$ iand after his death the'work was con' timued by Heineichs and Pott; who, however, so altered the'osis: gimed phen, (which was excellent) as to spoil it for the purposes) expecially had in view by Koppe. In fact, the principles maini taihed by rabosd Edititors are so heterodox, that, whatever may be' the learmiag and ability occasionally displayed, their interpretar' tions ought to be received with the greatest distrust and caution:

Koppe himself, indeed, was not wholly free from that leaven of heterodoxy, which has worked so extensively and perniciously in the greater part of the German Commentators for the last half century, from Semler downwards. As to the literary merits and defects of Koppe's work, the Editor cannot better express his opinion than in the words of the learned and judicious Pelt, Proleg on Thess. p. 47, " jejunam haud raro simplicitatem nimis coëmit pretio, profundioribus scilicet cogitationum rejectis rationibus; in multis tamen preclare sensum attigit, quamquam philologicæe etiam subtilitati non semper, ut decebat, operam dederit." To omit such heterodox works as are better passed over in silence, the Commentaries of Rosenmüller and Kuinoel have, (especially the latter) much valuable matter. The work of the former, however, (besides that the principles are very objectionable) is almost wholly a compilation. Far more valuable is that of the latter; its principles too are better, though what are called Neologian views not unfrequently discover themselves; and the work, being too often interlarded with some of the most pestilent dogmas of Semler, Paulus, and others, though accompanied with refutations by the Editor, is very unfit to come into the hands of Students. Both the foregoing works are, moreover, somewhat faulty in the Critical and Philological departments; being oceasionally deficient in accuracy, and in an acquaintance with the principles of the great Critics of the illustrious School of Bentley, Hemsterhusius, Porson, and Hermann. In Fritzche, indeed, we see a disciple worthy of his master, the great Hermann, and an accomplished Philologist ; but besides that the prolixity and excursiveness of his Commentary render it unfit for Academical ot general use, we may say of this, as of the foregoing works, and also of Dindorf's and Morus's Annotations and Iaspis's Version (or rather Paraphrase) with Notes, $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{e} \sigma \theta \lambda \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \mu<\gamma \mu e ́ v a, \pi o \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ $\delta \dot{e} \lambda$ vopa. ${ }^{1}$ In the exegetical works of Ernesti, Storr, Carpzov, Staudlin, Knapp, Borger, Tittmann, Winer, Heydenreich, Laur-

[^0]mann, Tholuck, Emmerling, Bornemann, and Pelt, thereis, for the most part, little which is really objectionable in principle; but they are more or less characterised by prolixity, obscurity, and the want of a clear and well-digested arrangement. In short, as it has been truly observed by the learned Pelt, (on Thessalonians, Præf.) "Quis neget, omnes fere N. T. libros novâ indigere eaque accuratiore, et ad nostri temporis necessitates accommodatí expositione, quæ grammaticis, historicis, Criticis, aliisque rationibus quæ in commentario conficiendo in censum venire solet, satisfaciat ${ }^{2}$ ?"

Hence it is abundantly apparent, that an Edition of the New Testament formed with a due regard to the advanced state of Biblical science at the present day, and in other respects adapted for Academical and general use as a Manual, is still a Desideratum. The older exegetical Works of the English School are confessedly insufficient of themselves for the purposes which they were originally intended to serve; and the later and elementary Works (besides being for the most part very superficial and unscientific) are so modelled on the older ones, as to be little promotivé of their professed object. In fact, in all didactic works intended for Academical and general use, it is now indispensable, that the matter contained in them should not only be as complete as possible in itself, but should fully attain to the standard of knowledge actually reached in the works of those who have most advanced the science therein treated of ${ }^{3}$.

This acknowledged want it has been the endeavour of the present Editor to supply; with what degree of success, he leaves to the learned and candid reader to determine.

The Editor will now proceed to unfold the plan of the present Work, to state the principles of Criticism and Interpretation

[^1] especially intended toó amanger
If is Thee Thest has tean formed (aftori long saqds repeated dxami-




 noet " pteponderating evidence ; critical cènjeckure being. wholly rexeluded; mand such alterations only intnotuced, as meet on the
 the cearly-puinted iriditions, but especially : upon the insuakuable Apirio Abincerses a and which have been alnendy adopted in me cor ambrec of the Cridical Editions of Beiggel, Wetstein, Grienbach, 7Mdethei, and Saholz: And here the Editor must avow his tated chisoetty though not from the Canons of Criticism professedly aeted
 gether frox the syatem of Receasions first: promulgated by him, hadrfounded apon misapplication of those camoss. The perpetunglyatids for the most part, needless cascollings', and alterations cof all hindsy; intneduced by him evince a temerity which would hane Aween thighly densurable even-in editing, a profanae vriter, but,s when mande ipithe Sadred Volumey, they intolve alsp al charge, of irmeve-





[^2] with those of the learned and indefatigabde Scholet.

Fuinher, the prespant Editot hasa so constructed bis Text, that shea reqder : will pormems thei advartage of having before him both therstephasiq text; land alsa the coorrected text formed on the
 ingig the Rditos apprehended, the true Greek. Fulgate; ;on which the heaned Dr, Noder hiascoo ablyf treated. To advent to the vasrious diande af alderations of the common sext, as they arise from the . insion, or the liasedtion of wordsy or from a change of one evord hinto amather, innothing whatever has been omitted, which himsia Preae im the: Stephamie: Text; ; such words only: we are, by the il-
 Latione, being here tplaoed within braokets, more ovi leds inokusive, iscending to the degree of suspicion attached to thems. Notting has been inseerted bat on the same: weighty authority; and even these wands ane pointed out. as inasertions by being exptersed iqua amaller chumacters All attervet readings have asterides profixed the odd onea being innrariably indicated in the Notes: Andisuchireadr inngs as, though left untouched,' wre by eminent Oritics thouight tp -meed alteration, have a $\ddagger$ prefixed. As to Various Rectingts; the anot important arenoticed; chisfly those which, atvough not admitted -intar the text af the preseat Edition; have been adupitedi boyr arte ar of of the four Editors abover mentioned, oy alte ffoundi im the - Editio Priaceps; or: those wherein the common Teit differssfrom othat of Stephena. In such cases; the reasons for not-addptiof ame usually given. And this has always been done in the case of alteandems of the Text, howaver minute. The Critical Notes are almost entirely original, and chiefly serve to give reasons for the mothods pursued in forming the Text. Such Notes would have 'been introduced more frequently, had not their introduction been forbidden hy the brevity necessary to be preserved in a wonk of tetifs natite. "It'also seemed to the Editor nore advisable to write fully $y_{\text {II }}$ and, satisfactorily on a comparatively small number of convoverted passages, than to introduce frequent, though brief, and theretore unsatisfactory, Critical remarks.

The division of the Text, not into verses, (though these are expressed in the inner margin) but paragraphs, is agreeable to the custom of the most eminent Editors, and can need no justification. Certain it is that scarcely any thing could have had a more unfavourable effect on the interpretation of the New Test. than H. Stephens's breaking up the whole into verses; thus, occasionally dissevering clauses which are closely connected in sense.

The Punctuation has been throughout most carefully corrected and adjusted, from a comparison of all the best Editions, from the Editio Princeps to that of Scholz. To each verse is subjoined, in the outer margin, a select body of the most apposite Parallel References, as adopted by Bp. Lloyd from Curcellæus. The citations from the Old Testament are expressed as such by being spaced out; and the words of any speaker are indicated by an appropriate mode of punctuation, and by the use of a Capital letter to designate the commencement of those words.

To pass from the Text to the Annotations:-These are, for the most part, of the kind found in the best Critical Editions of the Greek Classical writers; being intended to comprise whatever respects the interpretation, and tends to the establishment of the Grammatical sense: and in order thereto, great pains have been uniformly taken to trace the connexion and scope of the passage under discussion ${ }^{6}$. And here, together with the greatest comprehensiveness, there has been adopted the utmost compression consistent with perspicuity; so as to form an Epitome of exegetical and philological annotation. The method systematically adopted by the present Annotator, in order to ascertain the sense of passages of very doubtful or disputed meaning, has been this; to seek their illustration 1. From parallel passages of the N. T., or passages where the same, or a similar phrase, occurs either in the

[^3]writer himself, or in the other writers of the N. T.; thus making Scripture its own Interpreter. 2. From passages of the Septuagint (including the Apocrypha) Josephus, and Philo. 3. From the Apostolical Fathers. 4. From Apocryphal writings of undoubted antiquity, and which, whatever may be their claims to inspiration, are, at least, of considerable utility, as indicating the Theological opinions of the times when they were written, whatever those might be, whether earlier or later than the N. T.; in the former case; showing the opinions of the Jews previous to the promulgation of the Gospel; in the latter, contributing in various ways, to the interpretation of the N. T., and often establishing its authenticity and uncorrupted preservation. 5. From Rabbinical writers of unquestionable antiquity. 6. From the Fathers in general, Greek and Latin, of the first four centuries, including the Greek Commentators, Theodoret, Theophylact, Euthymius, and CEcumenius. 7. From the Greek Classical writers, especially those who lived after the formation of the Alexandrian and Hellenistic, common or popular dialect. The illustrations derived from this source are generally original, and when not specifically ascribed to any commentator or critic, may, in almost all cases, be so considered.

The Annotations have been partly derived, with due acknowledgement, wherever practicable, from the most eminent Commentators, antient and modern; but they are in a very considerable degree original. In their general character, they are elementary and introductory to the larger Commentaries; and they especially and systematically indicate and establish what the Editor conceives to be the true interpretation of disputed passages.

In the present work, the Editor has, as in his Recensio Synoptica, seen reason continually to search out the fountain-heads of interpretation as found in Chrysostom, and other eminent Greek Fathers, Commentators, Scholiasts, and Glossographers. And if he be thought by some to have employed unnecessary pains in ascertaining the antiquity of interpretations, he would beg them to ponder the weighty observation of Bp. Middleton, who remarks that "Theologians would do well to notice the antiquity of the opinions which they defend, because that antiquity is sometimes
no incansiderable evidence of truth.". He has; however, canefuily repressed any undue prepossession either in favour of awsiquity, of of stovelty ${ }^{7}$, and may say, in the words of Strabo, Aoólomat
 voured to combine simple and solid old views with ingenious. and learned neso ones; ever bearing in mind (with due restriction) the profound remark of Thucydides, when speaking of the uniow of youth with age in deliberation and counsel, vouíarrs véórqra mèv



1. In ascertaining the true interpretation, the Editor has always aimed especially at settling the Grammatical and the literal sense of any disputed passage, mindful of the pithy dictum of the greas Soaliger "that all controversies in Theology arose from mistakes' in Grammar," meaming thereby, in an extended sense, Philology: is. general. Thus the immortal Luther (as appears from Tittmdinn de Synonymis p. 41.) was accustomed to assert "optimum Grammaticum, eum etian optimum Theologum esse." In fact, the eqessity of Verbal Criticism (of which Longinus justly re-
 muegt be: apparent to all who are qualified to judge. Indeed; as ' BpuMiddaloton well ebserves, "when we consider how many there acorwho to warp the Scriptures to their own riews and propapansaiona it seems to be the ondy barvier that can be opposed syocesernfudy y against heresy and sohism."
.siyThe present Annotator has, moreover, especially kept in view stmplioict of sense, in opposition to contort, however erudite, inter-: pretatisus 2. Ow which subject it was well observed by Maldonati :

[^4]« Wrerior aliquando Vulgi quam sapientum sententia' est,'quod, duna simplicius veritatem querrit, facihis invenit."

It. is aleo an admirable remark of Bp. Midddeton, Gr. Arris3g. " 4 Is is better to understand' phrases accordiag to their obvionas iniro port, even though we shoubd be compelled to leseve the proof of their fitmess to more fortunate inquiry. When owce we blegiss te withhold from words their ondinary and natural signianacion, we.must not complain, if-Infidels charge our Religion with mgsticism, or its expositors with froud."

The Editor would further state, that all pretended Pleonams, Hebraisms, sec. are in the present work discountenanced, an well as all other Philalagical devices to dilute, pase, downs cr. explain away the sense ${ }^{9}$. Above all, care has been tahen nod to lower the diguity of certain portions of the New Testamentby ill judged attempts at explanation where all explansation must fall short. As to the much controverted subject of the styles of the New Testament, the present Editor is opposed to thes apiaions alike of those who regard the Greek pure, and uven elegant; and, of those who pronounce it barbarous and ung am ${ }^{\prime}$ natical. To maintain the former, after the labours of /si mansy: eminest writers from Vorstius downwards, were a vaing attempersi and as to the latter, it surely does not follow that, bechatrel somid words'ane found no where, else, they were coined by the starred: writers; or were barbarous; since there is great reason to woply pose that the Classical authors preserved to us do not cotrain tenth part of the Greek language, as it sabsisted at the bleginning of the Christian æra. The words then may have been used by the best writers; or they may have formed part of prow vincial or popular, colloquial and domestic phraseology, not preserved in any of the remains of antiquity. As to the nonobseryance of the rules laid down by the Greek Grammarians: semetimes imputed as a fault to the writers of the N. T., "it"is an excellent distinction of Tittmann de Syn. p. 231, "Scriptores.",
 P-T゙・
sacri grammaticas quidem leges servarunt, non autem grammaticorum ${ }^{10}$."

But to return, it has been the uniform practice of the present Editor and Annotator fairly to avow and fully to meet, the innumerable difficulties to be found in the N. T., especially in the Epistles, those best interpreters of the Gospels. But, in order to find space, within the narrow limits of a work like the present, for occasionally dilating on passages of acknowledged difficulty ${ }^{11}$, he has systematically excluded all such remarks as seemed trite and obvious, or likely to occur to an attentive reader; and such as might well be derived from Lexicons and Dictionaries of all kinds, as also from works introductory to the study of the N. T., and especially from Mr. Horne's invaluable Introduction, which the Editor considers quite indispensable to every Student and reader of this work, who would hope to use it with full advantage.

To some persons the remarkable diversity of interpretations of the N. T., as represented in the Recensio Synoptica and in the present work, may appear embarrassing. Yet this is no proof that the sense of Scripture is too uncertain to be ascertained, but merely that Exegetical science was for a long time, and has been, until a comparatively late period, in a very imperfect state ${ }^{12}$. The same diversities, indeed, occur, though in a less degree, in the Annotations on other antient writers. And it is well accounted for,

[^5]both from the great difficulty of the Books of the N. T., and also from the manifest insufficiency, as Critics and Philologists, of by far the greater part of those who have applied themselves to determine the sense of the N. T.; few of whom have employed that accurate and scientific mode of interpretation, found in the Annotations of the great Critics and Philologists of the eighteenth century on the Greek Classical writers. To introduce this into the interpretation of the N. T. has been in the present work (as in his Recensio Synoptica) the especial aim of the Editor; in fact, to accomplish that for the New Testament which he had already, in his two preceding works, effected for Thucydides.

The Editor may be permitted to observe, that one principal motive which first induced him seriously to apply himself to the Critical study of the New Testament was, that he might be enabled to prove to infidels that the Sacred Volume is not, as they aver, unintelligible, but that it can be shewn to be everywhere susceptible of a rational and consistent sense; if only the same pains be taken to ascertain that sense, which have been bestowed on other antient writings, nay even on some modern ones. That the Scriptures are even yet asserted by infidels to be unintelligible, is certain from the conversations held on that subject with Lord Byron by Dr. Kennedy and Mr. Galt : although, with the usual inconsistency of scepticism, that misguided genius allowed that there were no apparent contradictions in the Scriptures but what admitted of being satisfactorily removed.

The Editor has also made it his particular care to give a new literal version of, or close paraphrase on, all passages of more than ordinary difficulty, and a regular series of glossarial Notes on all words and phrases. In these he has endeavoured, in some instances, to combine and arrange what is scattered in the works of various Lexicographers and Philologists, and in others to supply their deficiencies. In all terms of dubious import he has endeavoured not only to fix the sense, but (in the words of Johnson) " to mark the progress of their meaning, and show by what gradations of intermediate sense, they have passed from their primitive to their remote and accidental signification."

The Editor cannot conclude without expressing his feelings of devout thankfulness for that Gracious Aid from above by which, under the pressure of various and formidable difficulties, and with such slender means only, as an inconsiderable benefice in an obscure situation could supply, he has been enabled to complete two such arduous, and, he trusts; not unimportant Theological works as his Recensio Synoptica and the present Edition of the New Test.; works which, as a faithfully attached Son of the Church of England, he has the highest satisfaction in reflecting are so strongly confirmatory of her doctrines, discipline, and principles. May she derive that accession of support from the contents of the present work, which it is calculated to supply! Then indeed, unsparing as have been the sacrifices of health, fortune, comfort, and whatever renders life desirable, which he has so long made in her service, he will not, under any circumstances think that he "has laboured in vain and spent his strength for nought;" but, looking forward to that final "recompence of reward," which he humbly hopes to receive at the great day of Account from the Chief Shepherd, and Lord of tee Vineyard, he will ever say,


15th May, 1832.





# EXPLANATION OF CHARACTERS <br> if 

 1. USED IN 'THE WOORK.' (See Preface, pi xi.)- denotes an altered reading.
$\ddagger$...... a reading thought to need alteration. it ts. it
[ ] ...... a reading considered, with somme probabinty as an interpolation.


The small type in the Text is used to denote that the words have not been found in the common Text; but have been inserted on competent authority.

## TO KATA MAT@AION

## EYAГГEAION.

##  'Aß ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \mu$.









C. I. On the general design of the Gospels, on their authenticity, genuineness, dates, contents, \&cc. the Student will do well to consult Mr. Horne's Introduction, Vol. 1v., and on the authenticity of the first Chapters of this Gospel, besides that excellent work, Mr. Townsend's New Testament arranged chronologically. With respect to the title of this gospel, 'Eiay-
 (from eiv and dy $\gamma$ chia) in the Clessical writers, signifies, in general, good news, sometimes the reverd given to the bearer of it. In the Septuagint and New Testament it almost always has the former signification, corresponding to the Hebr. Tre. In the New Testament it specially imports the good tidings of the Messiah's Advent, who should deliver men from sin and death, trough his merits and intercession; and the foundation of that spiritual and eternal kingdom predicted in the Prophets, and fulfilled by the mearnation of Jesus Christ. Hence the term at length became merely a name for the dispenation, or, (as in the Ecclesiastical writers,) by metonymy, the History of the circumstances otrich accompanied the promulgation of that dispensation. Our English word Gospel, from the Sexion God (good), and spel (news), well expresee the force of the Greek evaryencov. Tbe кatà must not be rendered secundum, cecording to; for (by an idiom found in the later Greek writers,) кara with the Accusative simply the force of a Genitive, i. e. roû Merociov.
V. 1. Bíi $\lambda$ os $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ evégecos.] Some suppose an elipwis of if dori. (See Marki. 1.) But that ${ }^{4}$ not necessary, expecially if the words B ( $\beta \lambda$ 位
-'A $\beta$ paci $\mu$ be regarded as a title, and kept apart from what follows, as in Griesbach's edition. Besides, it is now generally agreed that the words have reference, not to the whole of the Gospel, but to the first sixteen verses only. And $\beta i \beta \lambda$ os, like the Hebr. ר50, denotes any sort of writing, whether long or short. See Mark x. 4.
$\Delta$ auito.] So Mathæi Griesb. Knapp. Vater. Fritz. and Scholz edit. with the almost universal consent of the MSS. for $\Delta a \beta i \delta$.
vioū- $A \beta \rho \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu$.] vioū is for dxoyóvov, after the custom of the Hebrew, in which the correspondent word signifies any lineal descendant, however far removed i and in this extensive sense nepos is used in Latin. Here it is debated whether viov is to be rendered $a$ son, or the son. The latter is maintained by Bp . Middleton, $\mathbf{G r}$. Art. p. 163. Yet the general sense is only 'a descendant of David and Abraham;' which is what the Evangelist now proceeds to prove. That the Jews expected the Messiah to be such, is clear from Matth. xii. 23, xxi. 9, and xxii. 44.
2. è $\gamma$ évynce.] The repetition of this word throughout the genealogy is said to be Hebraic. But it is common'to all languages in genealogies, which, like law writings, must be very particular and plain, and therefore cannot but deal much in repetition. On this genealogy in general and in particular see the professed Commentators, and Townsend's New Testament Chr. Arr. I. 52. There are in the names which follow, numerous diversities of reading, and chronological and other considerations which it does not come within the plan of this work to discuss.
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#### Abstract

6．Eo入omш̄va．］So almost all the editions from Wets．downwards on the authority of the best MSS．The common reading，Zo入оцю̄̄vта， is equally agreeable to propriety，as in 组єעoфiō ； but it is deficient in MS．authority． dк тīs toū Oúpiov．］Sub．yuyaucos，and тóтe，or үevouévøs．The former ellipsis is akin to that of yuvi，Mทrip，rarrip，ulds，and the correspondent words in Latin；which，from their frequency，are allowed to be understood and supplied，not from the context，but from the nature of the subject．As to the ellipsis of the particle of time，it is unfrequent，and the examples which have been adduced are not to the purpose；yet it sometimes occurs both in Greek and Latin．  nifies about，i．e．a little over or under，a sense also found in the Latin circa and sub．Meтoıкeoia， transmigration，is an Hellenistic word applied， quasi por meiosin，to denote the removal of the Jews from their own country to Babylonia， and correspondent to a Hebrew word which ex－ pressed the full force of the term by captivity．

12．нетà тìv нетоик．］Some（as Kuinoel） render it＇at the time of the transmigration．＇ But the common signification after may very


well be retained；indeed Fritzsche denies that $\mu c \tau a$ has ever any other．And in the passage
 ทोмє́рау терьтє́ $\mu \nu \quad \cup \sigma a)$ he translates eractd die octavd．So on Matth．xxvi．63，he observes that broken days are reckoned as entire ones． It is to be observed that both in this and the preceding verse $\mu$ етоккеб．is for an Accus．with fls．

16．is גeүórevos］＇who is known by the name of，＇＇is accounted and is Christ．＇This idiom is not confined to Hellenistic，but is also found in Classical Greek，at least in the hin－ dred term кєк $\bar{\eta} \theta a t$ ，which is，however，almost confined to the Poets．

17．$\gamma \in \nu e a l$.$] This use of \gamma \in \nu \in \dot{\alpha}$, to denote a series or succession of persons one after another， is found not only in the Old Testament，but in the best Classical writers．See Wets．，Krebs．， and Loesn．

18．oïtcos］＇in the manner following．＇Thus the Classical writers perpetually use adjectives and adverbs of a similar sense．The use of the adverb for adject．is common both in Greek and Latin．
 absol．for Nomin．with verb．But that is un－








necessary；and the force of the Gen．absol． notes time more exactly．This use of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ in the sense nempe，or scilicet，at the beginning of a narration，is frequent in the Classical writers， and may be said to be both inchoative and ex－ planatory．See Hoogev．Part．p．100． 8.
－xply $\dot{\eta}$ बuve入 $\theta$ eiv．］On the use of $\pi \rho i \nu \eta$ Fith an Infin．，（said to be middle Attic，）see Viger．p．442，and Buttmann，G．G．p． 265. （Engl．Transl．）It seems to arise from roplv in－ cluding a sort of indirect comparison．Nuve入 $\theta$ ． is by some taken to mean removal to the hus－ band＇s house；by others，sexual intercourse，by an ellipsis of cis civijv，suppressed verecundiae gratid．The latter is by far the better founded interpretation，as being required by the con－ text，and supported by numerous Classical ex－ amples adduced by the Philological Commen－ tators．The difference between this and the Classical use is，that in the latter a Dative almost always follows．
 or $i_{\mu \beta}$ pvov．Examples both of the elliptical and plenary phrase are adduced by the Philo－ logical Commentators．Eijp．éx．is almost uni－ versally taken for $\tilde{\eta}_{\nu}$ èxova $\alpha$ ，i．e．eIX $\epsilon$ ．And repiokeotass is，indeed，sometimes so used by the Classical writers．Yet so to take it hers mould enervate the sense，and savour too much of that mode by which so much of the solid sense of Scripture is refined away by a certain School of Theologians．The antients（as it appears from Euthymius）took the word，（more correctly，I conceive，in its full force，for
 be（as Harenberg thinks）a reference to that examination by midwives，which in such a case was usual with the Jews．＇Ex тvev́matos dyov．Bp．Middleton has here an excellent Note，in which he fully exposes Wakefield＇s mistranslation of the phrase，＇by a holy Spirit．＇

19．sicacos．］This is by some antients and many moderns explained in the sense merciful， lenient；as we say a worthy good man．And so the Heb．prosy and the Latin equus，as the Commentators have proved by many examples． It is not，however，necessary to resort to this idiom here，since the usual acceptation is not less apposite，as denoting a lover of justice，and a man of uprightness and integrity．Being such， be determined to put her away by law，and yet，with that mercy which ever accompanies true justice，be wished not to make her a public example，hut to put her away privately．$\Pi$ a－ pabecymarioas．The word property signifies 10 bring into public notice；but，in use，it asenerally employed in malam partem，to de－
note expose to ignominy．It is only found in the later Greek writers，and the Sept．
$-\dot{\beta} \beta$ ou $\lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta$ ］This denotes，not will，or counsel， as it is rendered；but inclination of will．See Fritzsche．＇Amo入üoat，to divorce；as also Matth． v． 31 and 32 ．Mark x．4．Luke xvi．18，and the Heb．שלה in Jerem．iii．8．This use is perhaps confined to the later Greek writers．
－$\lambda \dot{a}^{\prime} \theta \rho a$ ，privately；inasmuch as that per－ mitted the suppression of the cause．
20．$\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \theta \cup \mu \eta \theta \in \nu \tau o s$.$] ．The word is here used in$ its primitive signification，which is，to turn any thing in mind，to reflect，meditate．The most apposite Classical example is Thucyd．ii． 40.
 тà т $\rho a ́ y \mu a \tau \alpha$ ，where see my note．
－loov́．］This，like the Heb．הכה，and Latin ecce，is often employed，as here，to prepare the reader or hearer for something unexpected and wonderful．It is rare in the Classical writers； but an example occurs in Eurip．Herc．Fur． 1066.
－äjeidos Kup．］Camp．and Middlet．ob－ serve that $a^{\gamma} \gamma \gamma \in \lambda$ os is used both as an appella－ tive，denoting office，and to be rendered messen－ ger；also as the title of a particular class of beings；when it becomes almost a proper name， and should be rendered Angel．
－тapa入 $\alpha \beta \epsilon i v$ ．］Scil．eis olkiav．The mapa refers to the parents，from whom the bride was received．Tò $\chi_{\epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \in ́ \nu . ~ T h e ~ n e u t e r ~ i s ~ c o m-~}^{\text {．}}$ monly used of the fotus in utero，since its sex is unknown．
 explained as put for aürdv，and usually ac－ counted a Hebraism；but the idiom sometimes occurs in the early Greek writers．See Math． G．G．p．594．It is not，however，properly put for aùzóv．
－$\sigma \omega^{\prime} \sigma \in \iota$－aivciv ］Mr．Townsend（Cbr． Arr．1．48．）explains，＂save them not only from the consequences of their sins，by his atonement，but from the dominion of their sins by his Spirit，to lead them both to obedience and to truth．＂Dr．Maltby（Serm．Vol．II． 546．）ably distributes the significations of the important term $\sigma$ odyetv into the four following heads．＂ 1 ．To preserve generally，from any evil or danger whatsoever．2．To preserve from sickness，or any bodily disorder；to heal． This sense is the most easy to distinguish；yet it has not been duly attended to in every in－ stance by our Translators．3．To preserve from the temporal anger of the Almighty，such as was manifested in the destruction of Jeru－ salem．This notion appears to have been ori－ ginally founded upon expressions in the Jewish A 2
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Prophets. 4. To give future salvation in Heaven. It might (he continues) have been desirable to have confined the use of the word save to those passages which come under the fourth class. Those in the third might have been interpreted to put in the way, or into a state of salvation."
22. lעa $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \theta \bar{\eta}]$ These are not the words of the angel, but an observation of the Evan-
 to what has been mentioned in the preceding narrative, but also to all other circumstances connected with the transaction there recorded. The ypa denotes, as Campbell says, no more than that there was as exact a conformity between the event and the passage quoted, as there could have been, if the former had been effected merely for the accomplishment of the latter. " Where (says Abp. Newcome) there is a direct prophecy in the Old Testament, the event did not take place for the mere purpose of fulfilling it; but God predetermined a fit event, and foretold it by his prophets." "God (continues Campbell) does not bring about an event, because some prophet had foretold it; but the prophet was inspired to foretell it, be-, cause God had previously decreed the event." The particles "va and "ymos must therefore not be too rigorously interpreted; since they often only express the consequence, or the event only, equivalent to so that. See the examples adduced by Newcome and Pearce, and especially the remarks of Wets. cited in my Recensio Synop.
23. in map ${ }^{2}$ évos] The earlier Translators, from Luther downwards, seem to have thought the Article here pleonastic. But the researches of later Philologists have shewn that it is very rarely such, though its sense cannot always be expressed. Here, however, it is
 and Bp. Middlet. observe, ) that particular virgin, who was prophesied of from the beginning, and whose seed was to bruise the serpent's head.
24. $\delta t e \gamma \in \rho \theta_{e l s} d \pi d$ roû $̀$ unnou] So Herodot.


25. ouk d $\gamma$ ivcoaкev] A common euphemism, like that of cognoscere in Latin. "Ewos of itcexc. "This (says Campbell) does not necessarily imply his knowledge of her afterwards, though it suggests the affirmative rather than the ne-
gative." The quotations produced on the contrary side are, as Dr. Whitby has shown, not quite in point. The suffrage, indeed, of antiquity (which speaks in the negative) is not lightly to be set aside. Yet even that was not constant and without dissent. Again, the term т пото́токos will not determine the case in the affirmative, because it was used, whether there were any more children, or not. Nor is there any emphasis in the repetition of the Article there, which is according to the regular idiom of the language. The question, however, is one of mere curiosity and we may safely say, with St. Basil (cited by Bp. Taylor) that "though it was necessary for the completion of the prophecy, that the mother should continue a virgin until she had brought forth her firstborn, yet what she was afterwards, it is idle to discuss, since that is of no manner of concern to the mystery."
II. 1. тoù ò̇ 'In $\eta$ où $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \theta$ évtos] ' (sometime) after the birth of Jesus.' On the chronology of the visit of the Magi, and the nativity, see Benson's Chronology of the Life of Christ, p. 74 ; and Dr. Hales.

- ripépass] for ppóvoss. This is called a Hebraism, but examples of it have been adduced from the Classical writers.
- $\mu \alpha^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ ] The term adopted in our Translation, wise men, is not sufficiently definite. The word is better left untranslated, as in the Syriac, Arabic, Latin, and Italian versions. It is of Persian origin, (Mogh) and designated throughout the East (and especially Persia, the original seat of this class of persons) the priests, philosophers, and men of letters in general, who devoted themselves to the study of divine and human science, especially medicine and astronomy, or rather astrology. Vide Menag. ad Diog. Laert. i. 1. Porphyr. de Abstin. iv. 16. Perizon. ad Flian Var. Hist. ii. 17. Hyde de Relig. Vet. Pers. xxxı. et Brisson de Princ. Pers. 179. 'And dуaro入ō̆ must not be taken with mapeyéyouto, but with Md yos. The passages here cited by the recent Commentators are few of them apposite, because the phrase is associated with an Article. The only kindred passage is, Matt. xxvii.
 Nor is the sense Magi Orientales. There is rather a subaudition of eो $\theta$ óvres, or something equivalent.










2. à̇тoù тdy dotípa] It would be out of place here to detail the various opinions which have been promulgated concerning this star; especially as the only probable one is, that it was a laminous meteor called a star from its resemblance thereto, and formed, and its motion regulated, preternaturally. Numerous Classical citations are adduced by Wets., showing the general belief that new stars appeared at the birth or death of celebrated personages, and otherwise had some undefined connection with the most important events of their lives. That, however, is no way connected with the present event, which is plainly supernatural ; unless we suppose that God, in using the instrumentality of man to the accomplishment of his own wise purposes, was pleased to accommodate himself to their opinions. It cannot be doubted that the Magi were taught the intent of the star by a Divine Revelation, (by which we afterwards, v. 12., find them directed) and therefore Kuinoel's remark on the confidence with which they enquire for the residence of the new born King, " satis definitè, more ejusmodi hominum," is very unfounded, since it takes for granted that they were little better than conjurors; an absurd and long exploded opinion.

- т $\left.\rho 0 \sigma x v घ \bar{\eta} \sigma \alpha_{t} a \dot{u} \tau \bar{\omega}\right]$ This construction with the Dative, is almost confined to the later writers; the earlier and purer ones using the Accus. With respect to the sense it is not possible to define the exact nature of this тробки́vŋбts, because in the East (though never in the West) the prostration of the body to the very earth (which this word imports) was paid alike to monarchs and to Gods. Whether, therefore, it was adoration, or reperential homage, is doubtful ; though, if we consider the Divine revelation vouchsafed to them, the Magi could scarcely but view the new torn exalted personage as one far above any earthly monarch; and, if at all acquainted with the Prophecies of the Old Testament, (which De cannot doubt) they might very well expect far more in the Messiah than the human nature. The word тpookuyeìv properly signifies to kiss ose's hand to any one; (equivalent to kissing asy one's hands) a form of respectful salutation. This, however, has reference wholly to the Greek and Roman customs. In Scripture the expressoa has probably never that sense; and to estimate its force there, the Student will do well to bear in mind an excellent observation of Dr.J.P. smith, Script. Testimony to the Messiah, Vol. 11. p. 270.

3. iтapá $\chi_{n}$ ] The Commentators say that this word is properly used of troubled vater, and is
thence applied to mental perturbation by fear, sorrow \&c. But, in fact, tapaíaco comes from rapaico and rápeo, cognate with our stir. In its metaphorical sense it is cognate with our harass.
4. roùs dpxípeîs кal ypa $\mu \mu a \tau e i ̄ s]$ i.e. all the members of the Sanhedrim. By 'A $\rho x$. we are to understand not only the 'Apxiepeivs, and his deputy, (the Sagan) but all those who had passed the office, and still by courtesy enjoyed the title, and who seem to have wore an Archieratical robe: also the heads of the 24 courses. The үраццатеis were persons employed either in transcribing, or in explaining the Sacred books, and were distributed into two orders, civil and Ecclesiastical. Among them were the vomıкol (or lawyers) mentioned in the New Testament, who were, indeed, the only persons occupied in teaching the law and religion to the people. See more in the writers on Jewish Antiquities, Koecher's Analect., and Horne's Introd.

- yevvà $\alpha a l$ This is by some taken for yevyy-
 the Fut. mid. contract. (Atticè) with the force of Fut. Pass. But it is very doubtful whether this idiom has place in the New Testament. It is better to regard it as a present, and, with Elsn. and Kuinoel, suppose it put for the Fut.; or rather to take it as used populariter to signify is to be born.

5. סıa тou тоффíou] The words following correspond neither to the Hebr. nor to the Sept. ; and therefore the Scribes are supposed to have given the sense rather than the words of the Prophet. And, as it is not professed to be a citation, but only a statement of the sense, literal agreement is not to be expected. The best mode, however, is (with several recent Interpreters) to take the words of the Prophet in the Hebrew and Sept. interrogaticely; which will be equivalent to a strong negation.
6. où $\alpha \mu \omega \bar{s} d \lambda a \chi\left[\sigma{ }^{\prime} \eta\right]$ A litotes for greatest. ' Ev тоís ri rıє As the Jews divided their tribes into thousands, with a Chiliarch over each, those Chiliads might, by Synecd., be put for the families themselves. I $\bar{\eta}$ 'Ioúda. Almost all Commentators regard $\gamma \bar{\eta}$ as used in the sense só入ts; of which they adduce many examples from the Greek Tragoedians. But in them, if $\boldsymbol{y}^{\hat{\eta}}$ stands for $\pi$ ólis, it is only by TóAts having the sense a country or state; for Seidler on Eurip. Troad. 4. and Fritzsche in loc. rightly deny that $\gamma \bar{\eta}$ is ever so used. There is, however, no reason to resort to the conjecture proposed by Fritzsche, тîs'Ioudaias. It is better to read, ( as did our English Translatorsand Light.
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foot) $\gamma \bar{\eta}$, taking it for $\dot{\text { e }} \nu \gamma \bar{\eta}$. And so Campb. Though indeed the common reading may very well be tolerated, if $\gamma_{\bar{\eta}}$ be taken in the sense district, canton, as in Hesiod Opp. 161. ' $\varepsilon \phi$ '
 is the same apposition, in which the Particip. of the verb subst. is to be understood, equivalent to a relative pronoun and a verb.

- погцауеi] This metaphorical use of moıц. to denote govern, is found in Homer and the early Greek writers, and seems to be a vestige of antient simplicity, and to point to the Oriental origin of the Greek language. It is, moreover, very suitable to the pastoral nature of Christ's' kingdom, on which he so frequently dwells in the Gospel of St. John.

 render, ' procured from them exact information.' Either sense is supported by Classical authority. - Фatvopévov.] This is not for фavéytos, as Kuin. supposes ; but the Particip. present is meant either to denote beginning, as Glass supposes, or continuity, as Grot. This construction with the Genit. was probably in popular use, though that with a particle of time and a verb would be more exact; q. d. ' the time when the star would begin to shine, or be shining.'
 Particip. is supposed to be pleonastic. But there may be a faint notion of speed intended; or rather it has in general an intensive force, especially with Imperatives. After all, this use of the Particip. is founded on that of the verb followed by a copula; which may he said to be a relique of the wordiness of early phraseology.

9. dкoúgayTes] Rosenm. renders 'obeying the King.' But though that signification is sufficiently frequent, it is not so natural as the usual one, which is confirmed by the Syriac version. We may render, 'so having received the King's commands.'. Прoŋ $\gamma \leqslant \nu$ aüroùs, preceded them, i. e. for their gudance. So Erasm. Thus it is not necessary, with many recent Commentators, to regard the $\pi p o$ as redundant.
10. eliov ] So almost all the MSS., Versions,
and Fathers, with the Editio Princeps and other ancient Editions; which has been received by Mill, Wets., Griesb., and Matth. And as it is sanctioned by the most certain of Critical canons, it may be supposed the true reading. The common one eijoov was first brought forward by Erasm. in his fifth Edition, and adopted, together with almost the whole of the Text of that Edition, by H. Steph. in his third Edition. 'Exáp ${ }^{2} \sigma a \nu-\sigma \phi o ́ \delta \rho \alpha$. A stronger expression than this cannot easily be met with. The addition of a cognate substantive to any verb is found also in the Classical writers, (See Matth.G. G. p. 597.) and is a vestige of the Oriental origin of the Greek language. The addition, too, of $\sigma \phi{ }^{\circ} \delta \dot{\rho} \rho$ to $\mu e ́ \gamma a s$ is a relique of early antiquity, when the superlative was formed (as in the Northern languages) by the addition of particles, usually put after the adject. So $\mu e \gamma d \lambda \eta \nu \quad \sigma \phi o ́ \delta \rho \alpha$ in Lucian cited by Kuin.
11. Eג $\lambda$ óvtes els $\tau .0$.] This is not for elfee $\lambda$., as somesay ; but it signifies ' having gone to the house, they sought.' $\theta$ ๆбavooús. Campb. rightly renders caskets: though $\begin{aligned} & \text { noraugds (as also the Latin The- }\end{aligned}$ saurus) signifies dंжo日ウ́кn, i. e. 'any receptacle (as a box or bag) for valuables.' Examples occur in the best authors from Herodo. to Herodian.
 ental custom, even yet retained, of never appearing before a King, or any great personage, without offering him gifts, usually the choicest productions of the country of the giver. Of this the Old Testament is full of examples. Markland ap. Bowyer, p. 50 . observes that this expression occurs seven times more in the New Tertament, and is constantly used in a religious sense, of offerings to God. $\Delta \bar{\omega} \rho a$, by way of presents. This is put in apposition. xpuady кal $\lambda i \beta$. кal gرípuav. From the nature of the presents it has been usually supposed that the Magi came from Arabia. But that is very doubtful. See Note in Kecens. Synop. Appendix p. 564. and Fritzsche in loc. As to the opinion of some of the Fathers, that the terms in question have a mystical sense, it is now justly exploded as a superstitious fancy.
12. Kai.] This is, like the Heb. I, used, in












This word, properly and in the Classical writers, signifies 1. to dispatch business; 2. to debate on it; as Thucyd. exp фь入ias tois' 'AOnvaıoīs; 3. to give audience and return answers. Hence the transition is. easy to the sense found in the New Testament, the Sept., and Joseph. Ant. iii. 8, 8., and xi. 8. 4. to impart Divine warnings, and, in the Pass., to receive them; the term being used either absolutely, (as Heb. vii. 5., xi. 7., and xii. 25., ) or with the additions $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}} \mathrm{d}$ toü $\pi v e \dot{u} \mu a \tau o s ~ \tau o u ̈ ~$
 Acts x. 22. The кat övap in the present passage, suggests the notion of Divine admonition, since dreams were believed to be occasionally sent from God. 'Avaкó $\mu \psi a t$, bend back their course, return. $\Delta$ pónov is usually supplied; but of the plena locutio no example has been adduced. The Classical writers usually subjoin ràte.
13. Alyurrov.] A better place of refuge could not be found, from its proximity to Bethlehem, and complete independence on Herod. And as there were many Jews settled there, who enjoyed both civil protection and religious toleration, it would be at once a safe and comfortable place of residence.
 mamely, 'what thou must do further.' Meddec, \&cc. 'For Herod is about to seek the child, for the purpose of destroying him.' The roü is not, as some say, pleonastic; but the Genit. denotes purpose, as often in the Classical writers. Byesa is here commonly supplied, though objocted to (together with most other ellipses) by our present philologists.
14. vuncds.] by night; to conceal his departure; and the very night of his receiving the vieion, to show his ready obedience.
 for finis vita in Latin. The plena locutio occurs in Homer, Herodo., and others of the more antient writers.
 Glled.'
 Hos. xi. 1.) are not cited merely by way of accomymodation; but, referring primarily to the deliverance of the children of Israel out of Esypt, they were secondarily and figuratively fulifled in the person of Christ. That Israel was a type of Christ, appears from Exod. iv. 22., where he is callod by God his son; his first born; whence also Irrael is put for Christ, Isa. xlix. 3. Now 282 prephetical prediction is then fulfilled, when
what was foretold is come to pass, so a type is then fulfilled, when that is done in the antitype which was before done in the type. It is no objection that the remainder of the prophecy does not belong to Christ, as Mathew only notices the resemblance between the type and antitype, in that both were called out of Esypt.
16. èveraix ${ }^{\boldsymbol{\theta} \eta}$.] 'was deceived;' literally, was played with trifled, with. A use similar to that of illudere in Latin. ' $\theta \theta u \mu . \lambda i a \nu$. The phrase is used in Esth. iii. 5. \& y. 9., to express Hamon's rage against Mordecai. 'Aжоoreinas. The commentators say there is an ellipsis of rivas or a $\gamma \boldsymbol{y}$ i $\lambda$ ous. It is not, however, necessary to suppose ellipsis at all, any more than in the Latin mittere, which is similarly used. When the Accus. is expressed, (as sometimes in Herodo. and other early writers, it is of more definite gense than the above. There is no pleonasm in dंжобreinas, but merely a vestige of primitive verbosity. Tois waīoas, 'the male children;' for though the masculine is sometimes used with nouns of the common gender, in reference to the whole species, both male and female, yet that is chiefly in the Classical writers, and where the context and subject suggests the right application. Besides, to have slain female children would not have answered the purpose in view. 'Oplots auvin̄s, its district, or terntory. And dıeтoüs кal кaтoorépo. There are few phrases that have been less understood than this, both as regards its nature and ratio significationis. It has been usually regarded as an elliptical expression for
 dieces, biennium. But the latter expreasion is quite destitute of authority; and the former is very rarely found, and only in plena locutione. And neither of the two is suitable in signification. It is rightly observed by Fischer de Vit. Lexx. N.T. that a masculine sense is required. But when he supposes a neuter form, he takes for granted what does not exist. The word has a masculine form as well as a masculine sense; and no wonder; for it is, in fact, an adjective with the substantive $\pi$ aadds, to be supplied from the context, and in the present case, roùs raidas preceding. The singular is used for the plural, as being taken in a general sense. Thus it is the same as if there were written $d \pi \delta$ deev $\bar{\omega} \nu$. This view of the phrase is confirmed by similar ones in Pollux ii. 2. víтıos dıeт́s. II. Paral. xxxi. 16.

 Numb. i. 45. As to the opinion of several recent Commentators, that $\delta i \epsilon \tau i s$ may denote a year















 $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta}$ тò $\dot{\rho} \eta \theta$ èv $\delta_{\iota \alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho о ф \eta \tau \omega ิ \nu, ~ " O \tau \iota ~ N a \zeta ̣ \omega \rho a i ̃ o s$ $\kappa \lambda \eta \theta_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \tau \alpha \iota$.
old, besides being opposed to the urited testimony of Ecclesiastical History, it is wholly unfounded, for there is not a shadow of authority for dierris in that sense. As to the authority of Hesych. (which is urged, $\Delta$ terís' $\delta_{6} \dot{o} \lambda o v$ erous) it is nothing to the purpoee, for we must there read either, with the editors, $\delta i^{\prime}$ ' eTous, or rather diecivotos, with Suid. and Pollux., the Gloss being borrowed from the Schol. on Thucyd. ii. 38 .
 סict. by ' $t$ ' ö̀ $\lambda$ ou тoü \&'Tous. Besides, the sense in question would be quite inapplicable to the present passage.
17. тóve $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega^{\prime} \theta \eta, \& c$.] The words may be paraphrased either, 'Then that happened whereby was more fully completed' \&c.; ; or rather, as the citation is only an accommodation of Jerem. xxxi. 15., 'Such another catastrophe took place as that recorded by Jeremiah;'a manner of speaking familiar to the writers of the New Testament. See Matth. xv. 7 \& 8 ., compared with Isaiah xxix. 13. and Matth. xiii. 14. compared with Is. vi. 9 . Matth. xiii. 34 \& 35 . compared with Ps. Ixxvii. 22. According to this mode, any thing may truly be said to be fulfilled, if it admits of being properly applied.
18. Opîvos-monús] A most pathetie accumulation of terms, with which Wets. compares a
 каl $\theta \rho \eta \dot{\nu}$ (Kuin. observes) are to be understood of the Bethlehemites.

- K入aiouga] Sub. ทע. A fine prosopopaia to introduce Rachel weeping for her children, as Ephraim is, in the same chapter, as lamenting himself. "Ott oúx cifi,' because they are dead.' The words must be taken, not with rapaкג., but with $\kappa \lambda a i o v \sigma a$. The Commentators bring together a useless profusion of passages in proof of the above well known metaphor. In the pas-
sage of the prophet the words must mean ' are gone (into captivity.)'
 plural for singular alike common both to the Scriptural (as in a kindred passage at Exod. iv. 19.) and the Classical writers, especially in speaking of kings and princes, See I. Kings i. 33, 43., compared with Matth. ix. 8. The expression
 Leusd. to be formed from the Heb. upz in I. Sam. xxiii. 15. The use of $\psi v x^{\text {viv }}$ for $\zeta$ coriv, though, no doubt, derived by the sacred writers from the Hebrew, is likewise found in Herodot. and the other early Greek writers.

22. ßarı入ev́ec.] Taken impropriè for ap $X \in \iota$, since Archelaus was not a ßarideves, but an
 in this and other similar particles, in the best Greek writers.
23. Kaтథ́кทбєy els] 'fixed his abode at ;' in contradiction to rapథкךซev. Els is for èv, at ; as II. Chron. xix. 4. катф́кทбev els 'Iepoo ${ }^{\prime} \lambda_{\eta \mu \text {. }}$ A signification common in the later Classical writers.
 to mean shall be.'. But to that sense it is here unnecessary, nay injudicious, to have recourse ; for that Jesus was so called in contempt (as coming from a petty town) is well known from the Gospels. Bp. Middlet. would render Nay. 'the Nazarene ;' "since the Art. could not be inserted, the noun being preceded by the nuncupative verb $\kappa \lambda \eta \theta$ njбєтas." This, however, seems a precarious criticism. In illustration of the passage, a coincidence has been sought between Nalsopaĩos and Nǎ̧lpaîos. See Judg. xiii. $5 \& 7$. \& xvi. 17. $\Delta \iota a$ т $\bar{\omega} \nu$ троф $\eta \tau \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$ is said because (as is rightly observed by Jerome) no particular prophet is meant, but the substance of what occurs in all those passages of the Old Testament which were supposed to refer to the contempt with which the Messiah should be treated.





III. 1. dv raîs ท̀ $\mu$ épats ik.] This use, for dv
 writers; and it is an accustomed mode of commencing a narrative, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. The difference is, that the latter use it strictly, when only a brief period is interposed between the occurrence to be narrated and some other event before mentioned; whereas the former use it with greater latitude, when there is a considerable interval ; as here of many years. Campb., however, thinks that as the thing last mentioned was the residence of Jesus, with his parents at Nazareth, the words iv rimép. Ekeíy. may be used with strict propriety of any time before he left that city. Mapariverat кripúrowv. This is taken by Kuin. and others for doरf $\rho u \xi e$. That, however, seems to be a mistaken view, and does not advert to the peculiar nature of the phrase. II apayiveơat here like mapuévat and mapépXerөat in Thucyd. and other writers, has the sense accedere, prodire, as said of those who come forward to deliver an oration. And кnpúgroe has a nearly kindred sense.
 properly signifies to proclaim; and 2 dly . to publicly teach, to preach. It includes a notion of earnestness and vehemence.
d Bamf torris.] A name of office, equivalent to $\dot{\circ} \beta_{a \pi r} i f \operatorname{cov}$, Mark vi. 14., and employed by the sacred writers, to distinguish him from John the Apostle. Baptism is universally admitted to have been in use with the Jews, as a part of the ceremony for the admission of proselytes ; and, indeed, with the Persians and other Oriental nations. This appears both from the Talmud and from allusions which occur in the Classical writers. It was believed that the administration of this rite would form part of the office of the Messiah. Nay, the mode in which the word is bere introduced, without any explanation, shows that the ceremony alluded to was familiar to them.
 ever, is to be understood, not an absolutely desert tract, but one comparatively so, being thinly inhabited, uninclosed by fences, and not in tillage but pasture, like the extensive commons lately existing in this country. And this is adverted to in the Heb. 727s, literally, a place to drive cattle upon. See farther particulars in Horne's Introduct. Vol. Int P. ı. Ch.ii. $\$ 8$.

- нeтауоеiтe.] This is well rendered by Campb. reform. The distinctions, however, of that Commentator here are rather ingenious than well founded. The word properly signifies to take after thought, as opposed to $\pi$ povociv. 2dly,
to change one's opinion. 3dly, in a religious sense, to so change one's opinion as to reform one's life.
 proaching,' ' is near.' 'H $\beta$ a
 observes, the state of the Gospel, the Religion of Christ upon earth, the Gospel dispensation. Bafaleía here denotes, (as Camp. remarks) rather reign than kingdom. Sometimes, however, it denotes a state of endless felicity in Heaven. And in other passages both senses (which are closely connected) seem conjoined; See more in Campb., Wahl's Clavis., and Rose's Parkhurst.

3. oütos.] Some would take this ठeıKтuкwis. But though that use is not unfrequently found in the Classical writers; yet it very rarely occurs in the Scriptural ones, and would not here be very suitable. It is more natural to regard the words as the Evangelist's. 'Hoatov roū rрофи'тou. The words which follow convey the sense, though they do not follow the exact terms either of the Hebrew or Sept.

- фwvin \&c.] - There is heard the voice of one preaching in the wilderness, and exclaiming, 'Eтоцца́бате тทiv, \&c. An image borrowed from the practice of Eastern monarchs, who, on taking a journey, or going on a military expedition, used to send forward persons to level the eminences, smoothen the unevennesses, fill up the hollows, \&cc., so as to form a road. To this purpose Wets. cites Suet. on Calig. 37. Joseph. B. J. iii. 5, 1. and Justin ii. 10. Plut. 837. Ovid Amat. ii. 16, 51. See also my Note on Thucyd. ii. $97 \& 100$.
 mean the camel's pelt orskin, with the hair on, as sheep skins were worn by the Hebrew prophets. See Zechar. xiii. 14. Others, however, more justly suppose that it was the shaggier camel's hair spun into coarse cloth. And we find from the Talmud, that camel's hair garments were much worn by the Jews. Nor were they unknown to the Heathens. Thus the Schol. on Eurip. Phoen.
 however, were probably made of the finer camel's hair, such as, Campb. observes, were formerly made in this country, and called camlets. Garments such as the Baptist's are still worn (or rather a manufacture of wool and camel's hair) in the East by the poor, or those who affect austerity.
- 乌áyทv $\delta \epsilon \rho \mu$.] So of Elias, II. Kings i. 8.
 aúrou. The austerity consisted in the materials; for otherwise these girdles formed a regular part of the dress, and were of linen, silk, or cven gold

- Mare 1. 5.

Infr. 12. 34 et 23. 33. Lue 3 7. Rom. 8 9. 1 These 1.10. ${ }^{1} 10.10$ Luc. 3. 8. g Luc. 3.8.
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and silver, according to the circumstances. See the references in Wets, or Recens. Synop.
 mitted to be eaten, appears from Levit. xi. 22.; that it was a customary food in the East, is plain from Agatharch. v. 27. Strabo. xvi. p. 1118 . Plin. vi. 30. \&c. (Wets.) From Aristoph. Ach. 1116. and the Schol., it appears that the Greeks also eat of them, but that they were accounted a mean food. That they are at the present day a common diet among the poor throughout most of the countries of Asia and Africa, which they infest, we learn from the concurrent testimony of modern travellers.
 to denote a sort of saccharine matter exuding from palm, date, or olive trees. See Diodor. Sic. xix. 104., (who calls it by this very name $\mu$ e $\lambda_{6}$ äभpıov) Joseph. B. J.iv. 27. Plin. N. H. xxiii. 4. and the Rabbinical writers, who mention palm honey, and fig honey. The more common opinion, however, is that this was honey procured from hollow trees and clefts of rocks, deposited there by swarms of wild bees. See I. Sam. xiv. 26. Judg. xiv. 8. and Ps. 1xxxi. 16.
5. Kal च $\tilde{\alpha} \sigma a$.] The кal is by Fritzsche not
 1. 6 ., is to be taken, in a restricted sense, for very many.
6. $\dot{\beta} \beta a \pi \tau i\}$ ouro.] That baptismal ablution or lustrations had been, even among the Heathens, thought necessary for religious ceremonies, and for the expiation of offences, the Classical citations here adduced by Wets. and others, fully prove and illustrate. That they were in use, too, among the Jews, we find both from the Old Testament, the Rabbinical writers, and Josephus. But the baptism here meant is one solemn ablution, never to be repeated, vestiges of which are found in the Jewish baptism of proselytes, comprehending the wives and children likewise of the proselytes. The custom, however, is believed not to have been introduced until after the return from the Babylonish captivity, and that to provide a less revolting mode of initiation into the Jewish church than circumcision. The Jews must have understood the ceremony as significant of a change of religion, and introduction into a church different from that of Moses. And that they should have expressed no amazement at this, need not be thought strange, as they wers taught by the language of the prophets and the instructions of their most eminent teachers that at the advent of the Messiah (which was now universally expected) the face of things would be entirely changed, and a new religion be introduced by Baptism. (Wets., Bengel, Kuin., and Rosenm.)
 for the simple verb, as it is a stronger expression,
of which examples (chiefly from Joseph. and the later writers, as also Philp, ) are adduced by Elsner and Wets. It is, moreover, a Particip. imperfect, ' after having confessed their sins.'
7. Фaptraiwn кal इadiouкaion.] On these Sects. see Recensio Synopt., or Horne's Introduction. 'Epxopévous-aùvoū. The sense is well expressed by the Persic and Syriac versions, 'coming for the purpose of being baptized.' So
 aüvoi. Of this signification of $\dot{\text { en }} \boldsymbol{i}$ examples are given by Wets. and Krebs. Here there is the less harshness, as the noun is a verbal.
 So they are likewise called by Christ himself, Mark xii. 34. xxiii. 33. Tís ivédeçèv juì \&c. The interrogative does not, as some suppose, here imply a strong negation; but the $\boldsymbol{\tau} \mathbf{i s}$ rather imports exclamation, (as in Galat. iii. 1.) namely, of expressive surprise to see persons of such dis: similar opinions and characters, (Sadducees and Pharisees, men of the world and votaries of pleasure, mixed with precise formalists, not to say hypocrites, unite in confessing their sins, in making declarations of repentance, and vows of reformation. 'O $\rho \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\eta} \mathrm{s}$. This is to be taken, by metonymy, for punishment, of which use examples are adduced by the Philologists.
8. картdv ǎ̌ov.] So almost all the antient MSS. (including the Edit. Prin.) and nearly the whole of the other MSS., which is received by Wets., Matth., and Griesb. The common reading кapxoùs dÉious was introduced by Erasm. on very slight authority: (perhaps from the parallel passage at Luke iii. 8.) and received, together with all his other alterations, by Steph. in his 3d edition; and thus was introduced into
 is said to be a Hebraism; but some examples have been adduced from the Classical writers, as


 defend the reading adopted in the text. Wets. paraphrases thus: 'If ye really repent, show forth not merely the leaves of profession, but the fruits of performance.'

 stronger expression. As to the Greek Classical idiom concerning doкeìv, it is here inapplicable. The phrase seems to be rather a pmpular expression (though it occurs in the Talmud) founded on a blending of two phrases. Sérecv èv dautụ̄ is an Hellenistic phrase occuring also in Eeth. vi. 6., equivalent to diavoeiv, secretly think, and answering to the Hebr. אמר. בלבו. Yet it Wecurs in a passage of Chrysippus cited by Wets.
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－Maripa ¿хореу тdy＇Aß．］＇we have Abra－ ham for our father，（and therefore，as his de－ scendants，cannot but be accepted by God．＇ ＇Baurî̀ $\lambda$＇$\theta_{\text {my }} \kappa_{0}$ T．$\lambda$ ．Here there is either a comparison of the surrounding multitude to stocke and atones，by a common metaphor；g．d． ＇God can effect that these stones，now lying in Jordan＇（compare Joeeph．Ant．4．3．）i．e．men as unfit for useful purposes as these stones，＇shall become children unto Abraham，＇i．e．imitate the virtues of Abraham．Or（according to others） the words are meant to strongly show the omni－ potence of God，who can raise up instruments to effect his own wise and benevolent purposes from the meanest origin．

10．$\eta \dot{j} \dot{\operatorname{con}}]$ i．e．the axe of judgment and punishment．PiYav hints at utter destruction； and the $\eta^{\prime} \delta \eta$ at what shall shortly happen．In the Scriptures men are often compared to trees； and sometimes（as Eccles．x．15．and Dan．iv． 20 and 23．）their punishment to the felling of trees．
＇Eкко́лтетаи－$\beta a{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda$ етаl．］The Present is used of a thing future，to express certainty．So New－ come paraphrases：＇And my exhortation is not only important，but seasonable also．The minds of men will soon be tried by preaching the Gos－ pel；and those who reject it will incur divine vengeance．＇

Il．dy ĖJaTl］The Commentators are agreed that the iv is redundant ；and they adduce exam－ ples from the Classical writers．It rather，how－ ever，denotes the instrument，as Luke xiv．34．and often．Bis metávolay．The cls denotes purpose． So eml supra v．7．This is a brief phrase，advert－ ing to the solemn engagement entered into by the baptized，to cease to do evil and learn to do well． This，indeed，was so closely associated to that baptiam，that it is called by Mark i．4．the bap－ tism of repentance．
 successor：But that conveys a wrong idea．The Present is here used as at ver．10．We may para－ phrase：＇There is one coming who will be after me in time，but who will be far greater than I．＇
 he who is conning，by which the Messiah was then， from the opinion of his speedy appearance，de－ signated；as in John＇s enquiry，oú el $\delta \dot{\text { e }} \rho(x$ ó－ mevos．The expression is a brief one，requiring
 Kupiou，to be supplied，as elsewhere．＇Inavos is equivalent to the $d \xi \cos$ of St ．John，as in Herodo． vii．36．and elsewhere．Tà viтodrиaтa $\beta a \sigma-$ тக́नa．＇ Y зóò $\eta \mu \alpha$ in Hellenistic phrascology is
 signifies to bear，and is equivalent to комiऽєiv in
a passage of Plutarch which I have adduced in Recens．Synop．Markland says it signifies to carry off or away．But that is only implied in the general sense，which is to have charge of， including both dंфaıpeīv，（as in Plutarch cited by Wets．，）and aंжoфépecv．From Lucian in Herodo．5．cited by Wets．ò dè $\tau เ \varepsilon \mu a ́ \lambda a$ dou入ıкcús
 may be added Hor．Epist．i．13， 15 ：Soleas portat． and Æschyl．Agam．917．）and other passages adduced by the Commentators，it appears that this was by the antients，both Orientals and Occidentals，accounted among the most servile of offices．Yet we find from the Rabbinical writers，that it was rendered by the disciple to the master ；and from Eusebius，that this de－ scended，with other observances towards the Rabbins，to the first Christian teachers．
－$\beta a x+i \sigma \in i-x u \rho i]$ There has been no little difference of opinion as to the force of $\beta$ arríce and $\pi v \rho i$ ．The most probable opinion is that of Chrys．and other of the antients，that $\beta a$ नríSciv here，in the sense obruere aliquem re，（on which Fritz．refers to Dresig de V．M．I．33．）has refer－ ence to the eruberant abundance of those extra－ ordinary spiritual gifts soon to be imparted to the first converts．With respect to kal mupl，Glass would suppose an Hendiadys，and take it for ignito：Elsner regards the cal as exegetical，（in the sense even）as representing the Symbol of the Holy Spirit．And this is confirmed by Euthy－ mius．In either case，there may be an allusion to the miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost in fiery tongues；which view is supported by Chrys． Others，however，as Wets．，maintain that by the symbol of fire is meant the severest punishment． or moral purgation－an opinion supported by some of the antient Interpreters，and which merits attention．

12．out td Trúov－aútoū］The oì is not re－ dundant，as Grot．，Wets．，and others suppose ； for，as Fritz．observes，if it were taken away，there would be no connection with the preceding．And he rightly renders，cujus（enit）ventilabrum （nempe）in ejus manu．＇The words $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ r $\bar{\eta}$ Xecpi
 fies，not fan（which is expressed by $\lambda i \operatorname{cocos} \nu$ in Is．xxx．24．and was something like our boulting machine，to raise wind by a sort of fan－like sail ；） but a winnowing shovel，which，from Hesych．， seems to have been in the lower part of it like a $\Delta$ ．The word is derived fron mríetv，to toss away．$\Delta \iota a k \alpha \theta a \rho \iota e \overline{.}$. For dıaka日apiбet，Atticè． The term signifies to thoroughly winnow．So

 an elevated area formed in the field，after harvest，






of soil hardened by the use of a cylinder, (See Paulsen ap. Fritz.) where the corn in the sheaf was trodden by oxen, (hence its name) and winnowed; which latter operation (misconceived even by the most recent Commentators, from ignorance of agricultural operations) was performed by toseing the rough and broken straw away with a fork; and then by stirring up the compound of grain and chaff with the $\pi \tau \dot{0} \dot{0} \boldsymbol{\nu}$; when the chaff was delivered to the wind, and the grain left in a heap. After which the chaff was collected and burnt, no doubt, for manure. Here, however, a $\lambda \infty 0 \nu$ seems to signify the above compound of grain and chaff to be winnowed; a sense often occurring in the Sept. Many examples have been adduced of кa $\begin{aligned} & \text { - }\end{aligned}$
 mentioned.

- тì $\dot{d} \pi 0 \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta \nu$ ] The word signifies any repository where any thing dxoriӨerat; chiefly, in the East, subterraneous, or partly under ground and partly above, but covered down and thatched over. By the $d x$ upou is denoted, not the chaff, but the rough and broken pieces of straw which went with it.

13. тóte] This, the Commentators think, does not mark the exact time when the baptism of Christ took place, but only points to the time when John was baptizing. Fritz., however, objects to that mode of interpretation, as too lax; and since tóre must always refer to a time in some measure defined in the preceding, he explains: 'tum, quum Johannes proxime prodituri Messix majestatem celebraret, ipse accessit.' The same indefiniteness is found at Matt. iv. 1. and
 says, the Genit. of cause.
14. סıeкcó̀vuev] was hindering, would have hindered. A not unfrequent sense of the Imperf., as denoting action begun, or attempted, but not completed. Campb. and Wakef. here entirely miss the sense. $\Delta$ texcion. is not (as most Commentators say) for the simple, but the $\delta \sim a^{2}$ is intensive. 'Eyci' xpeiay \&ce. A refined way of saying 'I am very far inferior to thee, and yet dost thou come to me, as to a superior?' For (as Grot. observes) he who binds another by baptism, seems to be inferior to him who is bound.
15. $\dot{d} \phi \in s a j \rho \tau \iota]$ Rosenm. and the Schol. explain permitte quaso; comparing the áptitwith in and the Hel). $\kappa$ o. But the interpretation 'for the present,' (confirmed by Chrys.) is far preferable. Indeed the former mode would destroy the em-
phasis which has been with reason supposed to exist in that word. The meaning is, that John must suffer him for the present to be baptized with the baptism of water, for that baptism of his with the Spirit was yet to be exhibited. At does sub., not $\mu \mathrm{e}$, but toüro єivat, which is confirmed
 institution, as often in the Sept. So $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \tilde{u}$,
 סıкакшјцата, at Deut. v. 24. And Chrys. ex-

16. Eevois] There is here a trajectio, (such as that in Mark i. 29. and xi. 2.) found also in the Classical writers, by which eivo is must be taken, not with d dé $\beta \eta$, but, as Grot. and others have seen, with $d^{\nu} \nu$ eco $\chi \theta$. for want of seeing which, the antient Commentators were not a little perplexed. I have pointed accordingly. Fritx. indeed, makes some not ill founded objections to eitùs being taken with d $\dot{\nu} \epsilon \varphi^{\prime} x^{\theta}$. ; and would join it, by a similar trajectio, with $\beta a \pi \tau เ \sigma \theta$. But though that method is less harsh, the sense thence arising is somewhat frigid. 'Avecix日l ${ }^{\prime} \sigma a \nu$ ol oupayoi. This is explained by most recent Interpreters of lightning of the most vivid sort, " by which, as it were, the heavens seem cleft asunder." So (they add) we find scindere and findere calum in the Roman writers. Such language was adapted to the common opinion of the antients, that the sky was a solid mass, and that fire from thence burst through the vast convex of the firmament. But this seems to be a mere attempt to pare down the wonderful, in order to make it more credible. It is better to suppose the light to have been preternatural, and to have accompanied the Divine Spirit. Such a light was that which accompanied Jesus, on being visibly revealed to St. Paul, at his conversion. Aive is by some referred to Jesus, as a Dat. commodi ; by others to John; by which the sense will be, 'to his view,' 'eo spectante.'

- wivel тeptorepay] There is an ambiguity in this circumstance, which has occasioned a variety of interpretation. Some understand by it the descent of a material dove, as a symbol of the Spirit, and with allusion to the innocence and meekness of Christ. Others, with more probability, take $\omega \sigma \epsilon l \pi \in \rho$. to refer to the mode in which the Spirit (in some visible form, probably of a flame of fire) descended, namely, with that peculiar hovering motion which distinguishes the descent of a dove, and which is adverted to by Virg. AEn. v. 216. cited by Wets. This latter view is learnedly supported by Fritz.
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17. \$co si dix d oùp.] Rosenm., Kuin., and Schleus. (as Wets. before them) take this of thunder. But thus a sense will arise which involves absurdity ; for (as Mr. Rose on Parkhurst Lex. p. 491. observes) "if articulate words were heard, $\lambda$ foroual simply tells us that the very words which follow were used, and the thunder is a gratuitous supposition. If it is meant that no uttered words were heard, only a stroke of thunder, which was to be understood as declaring that Jesus \&cc., reasoning is idle; for language could hardly have been used less appropriate to convey this idea."
 in the Sept., as 1 Macc. x. 47., for the Classical eidokeiv rive. The Aorist is not (as some suppose) here put for the present, but has the sense of custom, which is frequent in that tense. See Math. Gr. Gr. § 503.
 be taken, with the recent Commentators, for ${ }^{\eta} x^{\theta} \eta$; but the $\alpha v a$ may refer to the high and mountainous country of which the desert here mentioned, (whether what is now called Quarantafia, a rugged mountain range; or, as others think, the desert of Mount Sinai) as compared with the low ground about Jordan. The $\dot{\alpha} \nu a$ may, however, be intensive; and thus dy-will be for $\dot{\alpha} \pi-B y$ тоü $\Pi$ Holy Ghost, to express which personality, I have here and elsewhere used a Capital letter. At тetparөîva sub. \#ore, indicating simply the eat. Dıáßohos signifies properly a slanderer. It is sometimes in the New Testament an appellotions; but mostly denotes, with the Art., the great adversary of God; thus exactly answering to the Heb. close connection between the senses of slanderer and enemy. And though it is not found so used in the Classical writers, yet the verb $\delta \iota a \beta a \lambda$ Aerfac occurs in Herodo. and other of the best writers in the sense to be hated, which significacion I have fully illustrated on Thucydides. With respect to the mysterious transaction here recorded, no attention is to be paid to those writers (however learned and ingenious) who mainthin that a visionary scone, not a real event, is described. There is surely no sufficient reason to deviate from the opinion of the antient fathers and the generality of Commentators, who mainthin its reality; though we may not be able to explain certain points connected with this mysterious transaction.
2. ímépar тéбара́коита] Grot., Wets., and others here point out the preternatural or very
remarkable occurrences connected with this number. The chief coincidences are, that Moses and Elijah, the one a type, and the other a forerunner of Christ, both fasted forty days and forty nights.
 verbal ; an Idiom found both in the Scriptural (as Matt. viii. 33. 1 Thess. iii. 5. Eph. Iv. 28. and Luke vii. 11.) and in the Classical writers.

- ulds roû $\theta$ eoû] Not, 'a son of God,' as Camp. and Wakef. render. For it has been proved by Bp. Middles., that ulds tout $\theta \in o u ̄$ or vide $\theta$ eoú are never taken in a lower sense than $\delta$ vide roup $\theta$ coup, which is always to be understood in the highest sense. Thus in Mark i. 1. vide roü $\Theta \in o \bar{u}$ is spoken by the Evangelist himself of Jesus. In John x. 36. the same phrase is emplayed by Christ himself of himself: and in Math. xxvii. 40. is is used by those who well knew Christ's pretensions. Neither is viol $\boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \frac{\bar{u}}{}$, without either of the Articles, to be taken in an inferior sense; for, not to examine all the places in which it occurs, we have Matt. xxvii. 43. the crime laid to Christ, that he said "I am the son of God."
- eire] order. This is no Hebraism, but occurs in Thucyd. and the best Classical writers. So dicer in the Latin: "Apoc, loaves. "A "A (says Campo.) used indefinitely, is rightly translated bread; but when joined with els, or any other word limiting the signification in the singula number, ought to be rendered loaf; in the plural it ought always to be rendered loaves."
 for the Fut. $;$ or rather may be taken of what is customary. The ed el signifies upon or by. ' $\mathrm{E} \pi l$ mayti-Qeoù. This, explained allegorically, will signify the spiritual life imparted by Divine doctrine, a mode of interpretation confirmed by the authority of the Fathers. Yet as $\dot{\rho} \bar{j} \mu \alpha$ ( to which, however, there is no word corresponding in Heb.) may be rendered thing, as well as word, like the Heb. 7 , so the best modern Commentators perhaps more correctly explain, 'whatever is ordained by God.' "The temptation (says Campo.) is repelled by a quotation from the Old Testament, purporting that, when the sons of Israel were in the like perilous situation in a desert, without the ordinary means of subsistence, God supplied them with food, by which their lives were preserved, to teach us that no strait, however, pressing, ought to shake our confidence in him." So Wisd. xvi. 26. out al yevé-
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#### Abstract

5. тара入а $\beta \beta$ ável $]$ Пара $\lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v e t \nu$ often signifies, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, to take any one along with one (sapa) as a companion. Neither this term nor lornatv gives the least countenance to the common notion, that the Devil transported our Lord through the air. The latter is admitted to have the sense persuaded, or caused him to take his station. So xviii. 2. and Gen. xliii. 9. $\sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \infty$ aürdy dvaurion $\sigma o v .{ }^{\text {. Ayia }}$ ròııv. So called кат' $\varepsilon \xi u x \eta \nu$, as having the holy temple and worship. Thus the inscription on their coin was "Jerusalem the holy." So the Heathens called those cities holy, which were accounted the special residence of any of their deities.


- $\pi$ repóytov] On the sense of this term Commentators are not agreed. One thing is admitted, that it cannot mean pinnacle ; for thus there would have been no Article. And for the sense pinnacled battlement, assigned by Grot., Hammond, and Doddr., there is no authority. Unluckily we have no other example of $\pi$ Te $\rho^{\prime}$ yco used of a building: but as the primitive $\pi \tau<\rho \bar{d}$ has been proved by Wets, to denote the roof of a temple, so this is supposed by Krebs, Middlet., Schleus., and Fritz., to have been one of smaller size, probably that of the great Eastern porch. The most probable opinion, however, is that of Wets., Michaelis, Rosenm., and Kuin., that the term denotes what was called the King's portico, which overhung the precipice at the South and East of the temple. See Joseph. Ant. xv. 11 and 5. And this, as it appears from Euthym., was the opinion of the antients. Perhaps it was so called from the spire-like figure, which the end of the building presented from below.
 was a temptation to presumption; this, to distrust in God's Providence. The quotation with which the Devil subtly tries to effect his purpose, is perverted; for the promise of protection there given is limited to those only who endure the evils which meet them in the path of daty, not in such as they bring on themselves by rashly presuming on the protection of God. The metaphor in $\langle\pi 1$ Xecpwiv dpoṽ $\sigma$ l $\sigma \epsilon$, as Kuin. remarks, is taken from parents who in travelling over rough
ways lift up and carry their children over the stones in their path, lest they should trip and fall upon them.
 to make trial of any one's power, and here, of any one's power to save. The Commentators, however, are divided in opinion whether Christ is warning against presumption, or distrust. The former is the more probable.
 not absolutely to exhibit to the sight, but merely to point out, and here to indicate the relative situations and directions of the several kingdoms. Yet there is an obvious difficulty as concerns Toù кó $\sigma \mu 0 v$, and the term of Lu. iv. 5. T $\overline{\mathrm{s}}$ olxov $\mu$ evns; which is increased by the strong term máons. To avoid this, the best modern Commentators are agreed that the terms must be taken in a restricted sense, to denote Palestine only. And indeed undoubted examples of this signification have been adduced, as Rom. iv. 13. Lu. ii. 1. Rom. i. 8. From this very high mountain (most probably Nebo) a prospect would be afforded (as formerly to Moses) of nearly the whole of Palestine; and its provinces might be styled kingdoms, just as their tetrarchs or ethnarchs were called kings. See Matt.ii. 22. Perhaps, however, it is not absolutely necessary to adopt the above limitation. But if any limitation be adopted, that is greatly preferable to the one proposed by some recent Commentators, the Roman Empire.

9. пробкиขमiनns] The word here implies, not merely homage, but adoration, religious worship. The manner of rendering both was in the East the same, namely by prostration to the earth.
10. גaтpeúgets] The word signifies properly to render service to any one; but in the Sept. and New Testament it is almost always confined to religious service.
11. $\delta\langle\eta \kappa \delta \dot{y} 0 u v a i \tau w$.$] The word properly signi-$ fies to be an attendant on any one; but here and at Matth. xxvii. 55. and Mark i. 13 and 15 and 41. it signifies, like ministrare in Latin, to zacit at table, and, by implication, to supply with food. Sub. тpaxijats, which is expressed at Acts vi. 2.
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12．$\left.\pi a \rho \& \delta^{\circ} \theta \eta\right]$ Sub．els $\phi \cup \lambda a x \eta i v$, which is usually erpresed，as in Acts viii． 3 ．and xxii． 4 ． and Diodor．Sic．cited by Munthe．Or it may be（with Fritz．）regarded as an indefinite form of expression（left so in order to avoid what is un－ grateful）signifyying＇to be delivered up into any one＇s power，for harm．＇
13．Triy wapa日a入agriay］＇which is on the coast of the sea，＇or lake of Gennesareth．For distinction（it should seem）from another Caper－ naum．
15．Neq日aג；iц］Drusius would read Ne $\phi$ 日a－ $\lambda_{\varepsilon l}$ ，from the Hebrew．But the present reading seems better to correspond to the Syro－Chaldee， which was spoken by the Apostles，and，accord－ ing to whoee peculiarities of termination proper mames of the Old Testament would be likely to be conformed．
－jodv $\theta a \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \eta s]$ The ancient and modern Commentators are alike agreed that кaтá must bere be supplied．Yet they seem somewhat per－ plexed with the expression；insomuch that Fritz． regards it as not Greek，nor to be tolerated；and edits，purely from conjecture，＂\＄os．But this is alike presumptuous and unnecessary．The ex－ presion（as Middlet．well observes）partakes of the nature of a preposition，signifying versus， tovards．So ine p adert $^{2}$ in Thucyd．ii．96．and many other words in like manner become pre－ positions．We may especially compare же́́яà， which，though a preposition governing the Genit．， was formerly an Accus．of the noun répa，pas－ sage．＇Oode here signifies tract，as in the Schol． on fechyl．Prom． 2.
On this prophecy（which is by some impro－ perly regarded simply as an accommodation）see Hede，and Horne＇s Introd．Vol．II．p． 376.
 signifies，as here，to live，or be ；of which sense the Commentators adduce examples，as Judith v． 3． 1 Macc．ii． 1 and 29．Sir，xxxvii．18．Herodo．
 To which may be added Arstoph．Pac． 642 ．in
 word，in this senee，is almosi always connected with terms importing grief or colamity，there may
be an allusion to sitting，as the posture of mourn－ ers．इxóros and $\phi$ wis are，in Scripture，used to denote respectively the ignorance of irreligion， and the light of the Gospel．But here 中wis， （abstract for concrete，）signifies an enlightener， or teacher；of which sense Wets．adduces nume－ rous examples，as Hom．Il．Tr．39．фóws $\Delta$ avaoíat


 oxoteivy，similar to which is the morlis umbra of Ovid and Virg．＇Avéreldev．A continuation of the metaphor．So the Classical writers speak of the coming of some public benefactor as a light sprung up in the midst of darkness，（See Aschyl．Pers．229．and Agam．505．）for dyaved $\lambda \infty$ properly denotes the rising of the sun．Aujrois is redundant，not by Hebraism，but according to the popular use in almost all languages．

17．dixd то́тє］Sub．xpóvou，i．e．from the time that Jesus settled at Capernaum．＂H ${ }^{*} \xi_{a \tau o}$ $\kappa \eta \rho u ́ \xi \in \omega$, for $\lambda \kappa \gamma \rho u \xi_{e}$ by a redundancy common to both the Heb．and Latin，the Commentators say，and adduce examples．But it may be doubted whether there is any real pleonasm in the expression．Here surely there is none．

18．$d \mu \phi i \beta \lambda \eta \sigma T \rho o \nu]$ Properly an adjective with sixcvov understood．The word is used by He－ siod，Herodo．，and other authors，and appears， from its use，（See Herodo．i．141．）to have de－ noted a large drag－net ；dirruov，usually a small casting net；hence its derivation．
 a mere particle of exhortation，like ${ }^{d} \gamma \in$ or $d y e \tau \epsilon$ and the Heb．לh or לל7．But it is here and at xi．28．xxii．4．Mark i．17．and vi． 31. used in its proper sense to denote venite，or adeste． Buttm．rightly derives it from $\delta \boldsymbol{0} \boldsymbol{o}^{\prime}$＇＇tre．The $\dot{\sigma} \pi i \sigma \omega 0$ Mov has reference to the custom（noticed by Schoettg．H．H．in loc．）for diaciples to follow their master，and the expression is equivalent to ＇Be my disciple．＇That the Grecian custom was nearly the same we may infer from a kindred passage at Diog．Laert．if．48．where Socrates is said to have thus ralled Xenophon ：ymou toivù
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 gain men over to the Gospel. So Plato in his Sophista, compares the sophist, or teacher of wisdom, to a fisher. And in Stob, Serm. p. 313.

 remarks, terms of hunting and fishing are often used by the Classical writers of conciliating friends, or gaining disciples.
 some in $^{\text {in }}$ the boat.' II oior, indeed, is a general term to denote a vesel of any size; but it must here denote the ship, i.e. their ship.
23. $\pi$ cofiñरev] obiit, peragravit. Act. for mid.,
 ence to the plural implied in the preceding $\Gamma a \lambda_{t}$ גaiav. A common idiom, on which see Matth. Gr. Gr. $\$ 435$.

- уócov каl mà $\sigma a \nu$ pa入.] Kuin. regards the terms as synonymous, which they certainly sometimes are, but not here. The former is explained by Markl. a disease of some standing ; the latter, a temporary ailment. Nóros, however, rather denotes a thoroughly formed disorder, whether acute, or chronic; $\mu a \lambda$ axía, an incipient indisposition, or malady. See Euthym. חã̃av signifies ' of every sort,' a sense occurring both in the Scriptural and Classical writers.

 aíroù is a Gent. of object signifying de en. 'Axoi, fame ; as in Thucyd. i. 20. So the Latin auditio for fama.
- $\beta$ aqad́vois $\quad$ ouvexoutévous] Bdaavos signifies 1. a touchstone ; 2. examination, or trial by torture ; 3. torture itself, or any tormenting malady, of which signification examples are adduced by Wets. Euvéxecoat is often used with a Dative of some disorder, (see the examples of Wets.) and has reference to such as confne the patients to their bed.
 ' those who were possessed with dxamons, and those who were lunatic,' or epileptic. The two appear to be clearly distinguished; and, for various reasons, could not be the same. There is surely no necessity to abandon the common interpretation, supported by all the ancient and rearly
all the most eminent modern Commentators, that darmoniacs were really persons possessed with evil spirits. As to the hypothesis of Mede, Farmer, and others, it is, however ingenious, in contrariety to the plain language of Scripture, and leads to consequences the most awkward. It is true that the Jews (from a superstition probably derived from the Heathens, among whom they had been in captivity) ascribed violent disorders to the agency of evil spirits. Hence it has been maintained that the Evangelists, in relating the cures of maniacs, merely adopted the popular phraseology of their countrymen; as with us the use of similar terms implies no belief in the superstitions with which they are connected. The highly figurative character of Oriental style is much insisted on; and it is urged that in the dæmoniacs in question no symptoms are recorded which do not consist with those of insanity and epilepsy, at the present day. Finally, that our Lord at Lu. iv. 39 . is said to have rebuiked a fever. These arguments, however, are any thing but conclusive, and weigh very light against the strong evidence for the common interpretation. Thus Christ is represented addressing the damons, as separate and distinct from the possessed persons. The former are represented as performing personal actions of various kinds. "When 1 find (says Dr. Campb.) mention made of the number of dæmons in particular possessions, their actions so expressly distinguished from those of the man possessed, conversations held by the former in regard to the disposal of them after their expulsion, and accounts given how they were actually disposed of ; when I find desires and passions ascribed peculiarly to them, and similitudes taken from the conduct which they usually observe, it is impossible for me to deny their existence." It may be added that the demoniacs every where address Jesus as the Messiah; which was not by any means the case with those who were merely labouring under bodily disorders. Finally, to thus fall in with popular error and delusion were surely very unlike the practice of our Lord, quite unsuitable to his character as vice-gerent of the all perfect Deity; and utterly inconsistent with that of the Evangelists, as inspired teachers of God's holy Religion.
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Ch．V．1．louis tows oxdous－bpos．］＇Seeing so great a concourse＇，\＆c．Td pos．As the Article does not allude to any before mentioned， or definite mountain，it is by many Commentators regarded as indefinite，like the Heb． $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ，or put for $\tau i$ ．The principle，however，is unsound，both as respects the Greek and the Hebrew．Fritz． has shown its futility in the latter；and in the former it is almost universally exploded．We may，then，with Middlet．，leave the Art．its de－ finite force，and suppose $r \boldsymbol{r}$ of pos to denote the mountain－district，as distinguished from the other two o；as Gen．xix． 17 ．and Josh．ii．22．He is of opinion that our Lord would not lead the multi－ tide to Mount Tabor，（which has been com－ monty supposed the scene of the discourse）as part of the ridge lay much nearer to Capernaum．
 Kain．This，however，is unnecessary．The construction here adopted is found in Herodot． and other writers．K $a \theta$ ．has reference to the pasture in which the Jewish doctors taught，the master sitting，while the disciples stood．
2．ajoiEas to orojua abтoì This is usually esteemed an Hebraism ；but Wets．has adduced very similar expressions from the Greek Classics； and the expression may rather be considered as a prestige of the simplicity and redundancy of primitive phraseology，afterwards retained with verbs of speaking，on occasions of more than usual importance and gravity．Sometimes it is used instead of a verb of speaking，as in Ps ． 1 xx viii． 12 ．

 sense here partly depends upon the construction， on which Commentators are not agreed．Many of the modern ones join тب̣̂ $\pi \nu$ vii $\mu a t \iota$ with $\mu$ ak．．； while the greater number，and nearly all the ancient ones，construe it with $\pi$ reaxof．And this seems preferable；for the former method， though it yields a tolerable sense，does violence to the construction，and breaks that uniformity of expression，which runs through the several мearaptreot．By the poor in spirit are meant those who are of a bumble disposition．So Eathym．of ratecuol $\tau \bar{j}$ mpoaipecer．See 1．1 xvi．2．Here $\tau \bar{\varphi} \pi v e \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \iota$ is added，in order to determine the sense．The Art．in $\tau \bar{\varphi} \pi \nu \varepsilon \dot{\varphi} \mu$ ． is for the poss．Pron．See Middles．

4．of mev0ounves］This is by some rendered， ＇those who bear afflictions with resignation．＇ But it is better，with Chrys．and some moderns， as Guin．and others，to interpret，＇those who mourn for their sins．＇See Is．lvii．18．and James iv．9．Ia рaк入ทөทiбovтa！，＇they shall be comforted；＇namely，with the humble hope of final acceptance and salvation．

5．oi traceis］＇the meek，gentle，and forgiving．＇ It is not apathy which is enjoined，but a regula－ tion of the passions．The blessing here promised （taken from $\mathrm{Ps}_{\mathrm{s} .}$ xxvii．11．）is primarily an earthly，but terminates in a heavenly one；not a temporal，but an eternal inheritance．
 ardently pursue，and，as naturally，seek after it as men do to satisfy hunger and thirst．By סuxasooúvyv is denoted the performance of all the duties which God has enjoined．Xopras－ 0yंбovial．The Interpreters variously supply what is here wanting to complete the sense．The best method seems to be that of Euthym．，（after Chrys．）who simply supplies davids aya0oṽ， i．e．with every good，both in this world，and in the next．The word is properly used of animals， but is in the later writers applied to men．
7．è eोeŕroves」＇merciful and compassionate．＇
 compassion；＇namely from God，in pardon and acceptance；and（as seems to be also implied） usually from man．See Prov．xi．25．Such is the view taken by Chrys．and most antient Inter－ praters，and some of the best modern Commenta－ tors．
8．oi кaөapol $\tau \hat{1}$ кapoiac］i．e．＇the pure at heart，＇as contradistinguished from those who， like the Pharisees，only aimed at an outward and ceremonial purity．So the Heb．בר לבב and nat Ps．xxiv．4．and Gen．xx． 50. Many parallel sentiments are adduced by Wets． from the Classical writers．Wets，and Camps． think there is here a reference to the advantages possessed by those who were legally pure．This， however，is－somewhat fanciful；and there seems to be no more than a faint allusion thereto．Tody Oed $\mathbf{\delta}$ foveas．A phrase occurring also at Heb．xii．14．，which is best explained as indi－ cating the favour of God here，and his final accept－ ance，by salvation，hereafter．In the East，where monarchs were seldom seen，and seldomer ap－
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proached by their subjects，it is no wonder that introduction to them was an image of high honour and happiness．
9．eip $\nu о$ ооо 0 ］i．e．not only those who are peaceably inclined，but also who study to preserve
 be．＇A signification common both in the Scrip－ tural and Classical writers．Oi uiol Өeoṽ，namely as imitating and bearing resemblance to God， who is styled the God of peace．See Rom．xv． 20．and 2 Cor．xiii．11．So Philo de Sacr．of $\tau \delta$
 Өeoū．Similar expressions，too，occur in the Pagan Philosophers，who are supposed to have borrowed them from the Heathens．It is here implied that they will be loved and blessed with a truly paternal affection．
 properly signifies to hunt ； 2 dly ，to pursue any one for apprehension；3rdly，in a metaphorical sense，to pursue with acts of enmity，to persecute， as in the present passage，which is akin to 1 Pet．iii．14．d $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ el кal тdб्रоเтe $\delta \iota \alpha$ 8uкatoóviqv，maкdiptot．In both the sense is， ＇for the sake of virtue and true religion．＇

11．ठัтav óveıoíawaty］．for el ovecolfovaiv． Sub．au $0 \rho \omega \pi=\iota$ ，by an ellipsis common to most languages．Some of the best Commentators are of opinion that，having in the former verse touched on persecution generally，our Lord here descends to particulars，and notices one special act of it，namely，prosecution before human tri－ bunals，on account of religion．Dcobkecy is a well known forensic term to denote prosecute； and the other expressions in this sentence may have reference to judicial insult and gross abuse， as well as injustice．Possibly，however，dью́ксо may be taken here in the same sense as in the preceding verse，the sense there being only fur－ ther developed here．廿evòómevol is Particip．for adv．
 not，as Kuin．supposes，synonymous；but the latter is a much stronger term than the former， though there is no proof that it properly signifies （as the Interpreters say）to loap for joy．The sense of $\mu \cdot \sigma \theta d s$ need not here be pressed on， since it must signify a reward assigned of mere grace．See Rom．iv． 4.

13．dove］＇are，or are to be，＇＇should consider
 So Livy，cited by Grot．calls Greece the cal gen－
tium；salt being a common symbol of wisdom． The meaning is，＇What salt is to food，by sea－ soning and by preserving it，so ought ye to be to the rest of men．Others are to learn from you， and ye are to be examples to others．＇Mcopav $\hat{y}_{\tilde{y}}$ ， ＇becomes insipid＇（äva入ò үévทrat，as Mark ix． 50．）This sense is derived from that signification of $\mu \omega \rho d s$ ，by which，like the Latin fatuus，and the Heb．תחתלח，as applied to objects of taste，it denotes insipid．The word is properly cognate with Maupos，debilis．Thus we use faint in the sense insipid．It is certain that rock salt may lose its savour ；but probably not sea salt．And as the allusion is somewhat recondite，most recent Commentators have（with Schoettg．）supposed that a bituminous salt is here meant，procured from the lake Asphaltites，and which，having a fragrant odour，was thickly strewn over the sacrifices in the temple，to counteract the smell of the burning flesh．Now as large quantities were laid up in the temple for this use，it would often spoil by exposure to the sun and atmo－ sphere，and was then，we learn，scattered over the pavement，to prevent the priests from slip－ ping，in wet weather．＂This is，then，thought to be an allusion to the temple service，very likely to have been made by our Lond，as being at once familiar to his hearers，and very forcible．${ }^{\beta}$ ． Ingenious，however，as the above interpretation is，it is not quite necessary to be adopted．There is here only a case supposed，which does some－ times，though rarely，occur．Indeed the above view seems to be at variance with the parallel passage at Lu．xiv．35．oűte els $\gamma^{\text {ñ }}$ ，oüтe cis
 At $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ тivı sub．тоо́тゅ，an ellip．frequent in the Classical writers．
 world；＇i．e．the means by which God is pleased to enlighten the minds of men with true religion， as the world is enlightened by the rays of the sun，which is，in the proper sense，to фwis tou кóб号v．The term was frequently applied by the Jews to their teachers，as among the Greeks and Romans celebrated persons were called
 \＆c．It is commonly supposed that this being connected with ver．16．，in which is the appli－ cation of the similitude oण̃ $\lambda \alpha \mu \psi \alpha \tau \infty \quad$ \＆c． there is an ellip．of ca0ces；as Is．Iv．9．and Jer．iii．20．But perhaps it is better to suppose that in these words is implied the corresponding












clanse "So neither can you remain in secret, the eyes of all being turned upon you." Then ver. 16. will supply an admonition founded on what is brought forward in the two preceding verses.
15. кaiovat for the more Classical axtrovas, which is used by Lu. viii. 16. xi. 33. Yet examples of it have been adduced, chiefly from the later writers, and in the passive. So also urere for accendere. See Facciol. Lex. The sentence contains a proverbial saying, to express depriving any thing of its utility by putting it to a use the farthest from what it was intended for. The words
 are momadic nouns, as denoting things of which there is usually one only in a house. See Middlet. and Campb.
 $\Delta \circ \xi a \nmid c w$ in the sense praise, glorify, is Hellenistic. In Classical Greek it only signifies to think, cappose.
17. «aralū̄al] ' to abrogate, annul.' A sense, as applied to laws, or institutions of any kind, often occurring in the Classical writers. Our Lord here anticipates an objection, namely, that his doctrines differed, in some respects, from the Moasic, and that therefore his system could not bat destroy that promulgated by God to Moses, and borne testimony to by the Prophets. By oferos must be meant, in a certain sense, the law of Moses; that being the invariable sense of the word in the Gospels and Acts. Some, however, anderstand the ceremonial, others the moral law. Each, indeed, may be said to be meant. For the ceremonial law was completed by our Lord in answering the types and fulfilling the prophecies; the moral, by his exalting its precepts to a spirituality before unknown, and purifying it from the corruptions of the Jewish tescbers. This assurance of our Lord was made, worrect the false opinion of the Jews, that the Messiah, would raise the Mosaic law to the greatest perfection, and literally fulfil the happy predictions of the Prophets.
18. dmiv.] A word derived from the Heb., and used either at the beginning or the end of a santence. In the formar case it has the affirmative zense verily, and is equivalent to val or depens in the latter, it is put for yevosto, 'so be it!' 'Bee \&v rape $\lambda 0 p$ oup. is a proverbial phraee, to denote that a thing can never happen,
often occurring in Scripture. (See Ps, cxix. 46. Job xi. 9. Luke xvi. 17. Matt. xxiv. 35. Is. V. 10. Jer, xxxiii. $20 \& 21$. Job xiv. 12.) and sometimes in the Classical writers. So Dio. cited by

 Dionys. Hal. vi. 95. where it is provided in a treaty, that there shall be peace $\mu \in x \rho t s \dot{\alpha} \nu$ oujga-
 words $\dot{\delta}$ oupavds кal $\eta_{\gamma \hat{\eta}}$ form a periphrasis for the universe, which the Jews supposed was never utterly to perish, but would be constantly renewed. See Baruch iii. 32. \& i. 11. So Phil. Jud. 656. where he says that the laws of Moses

 Something very similar is cited by Wets. from a Rabbinical writer.

- lä̃a-кераia.] The former denoted pro. perly the letter Jod (that being the smallest of the letters in the Hebrew alphabet, ) and figuratively, any thing very small. The latter, the apices, or cornicula, which distinguished similar letters, as תרבכ ; but was used figuratively to denote the minutest parts of any thing. Similar sentiments are cited from the Rabbinical writers. "Bass \&v, тávта $\gamma$ évŋтat ' until all shall come to pass,' i.e. be accomplished, namely, by the fulfilment of the legal types and prophecies, and the complete establishment of the moral law.

19. $\lambda$ úvy.] 'shall neglect, or transgress.' A sense common in the Classical writers, and here
 there is an allusion to the practice of the Pharisees, who, to favour their own lax notions of morality, divided the injunctions of the law into the weightier, and the lighter. The transgression of the latter they held to be very venial. And by their own arbitrary classification of these, they evaded the spirit, while they pretended to fulfil the letter, of the law. 'B入dxi Said per meiosin for, 'he shall be farthest from attaining heaven,' i. e. 'he shall not attain it at all.' By the antithesis, péras must be for $\mu$ jerioros, of which the Commentators adduce examples, to which may be added another in Plato ap. Matth. G. G. §. 266. Here only a high degree of the positive can be meant. Méyas $\kappa \lambda \eta \theta \eta \sigma e \tau a l$, 'he shall be great,' i. e. in favour, scil. тapa ${ }^{\prime}$ ḗ; on which sense see my Note on Thucyd. i. 138.











20. $\pi \epsilon \rho เ \sigma \sigma \in \in \cup \sigma \eta$, \&c.] ' shall excel.' Here our Lord fully declares his meaning; openly naming those whom he had before only hinted at. The sentence is, as it were, an answer to a question ; q.d. "What, will not the righteousness of the law, as exhibited in the lives of such holy persons as the Pharisees, save us?" "No such thing-but I plainly tell you that unless," \&c. It is clear סוкatooúvy must here denote, like the Heb. צרקה, piety and virtue as evinced in a life spent agreeably to the Divine commands, especially in the cultivation of the moral virtues.
21. lois $\dot{d} \rho$ patios.] It is controverted whether this should be rendered 'by, or to them of old time.' The former is maintained by most of the Commentators from Beza downward; the latter, by the Fathers and the antient versions, and a few modern Commentators, as Doddr., Campo., and Rosenm. Upon the whole, the former interpretation seems to deserve the preference, as being most suitable to the context, and confirmed by the usage of the later writers, especially the Sept. and New Testament. And the words will thus be akin to a Talmudic saying, which may be rendered, ip $\dot{\prime} \kappa a \sigma t \nu$ of $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi$ aioli $\eta \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$. By oi aipxaĩo Kun. understands the Jewish teachers not long before the age of the Gospel. And Fritz., who embraces this opinion, observes that the notion of $d \rho$ रaios is relative, so that what some would esteem new, others would account old. Certain it is that in that age the moral law had been utterly perverted; and that our Lord meant to allude to that corruption, is plain from what follows. "Evoxos हैनтat $\tau$ in крíce, ' will be liable to the judgment.' So Plato, cited by
 which may be added, tischin. p. 47. 10. $\alpha \mu \alpha \rho-$
 ferior Court of Judicature, consisting of 23 judges, (as the Rabbins say) or according to Joseph. Bell. Jud. i. 20, 5. \& Ant. iv. 8, 14., seven judges.
 arising from the Jews being accustomed to regard all Israelites as brethren. Elk $\bar{\eta}$, ' without suffclient cause;' implying also above measure. Critics are divided in opinion as to the genuineness of the word, which is rejected by Erasm., Bengel, Mill, and Fritz., but defended by Grot., Wets., Griesb., and Matthei. The arguments of the latter seem to me to preponderate. The authoritz indeed of MSS. for its omission is next to
nothing; and that of versions slender. 'Evoxos éotat $\tau \hat{n} \times \rho \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$, i. e . is liable to such a punishment in the other world as may be parallelled with that which the Court of Seven inflicts. 'Paxá. A term of strong reproach, equivalent to 'a vile worthless fellow. Mw pix. A term expressive of the greatest abhorrence, equivalent to 'thor impious wretch,' for, in the language of the Hebrews, folly is equivalent to impiety. F'éevas tout $\pi$ upós. réèva is formed from the Hebr. נ the valley of Hinnom, a place near Jersalem, where formerly children had been sarificed by fire to Moloch; and which long afterwards had been held in such abomination, that dead carcasses were thrown into it, (as in the Cæadas mentioned in Thucyd. i. 134.) which, in so hot a climate, needing to be consumed by fire, it obtaine its name yéevja toü тupós. Both from its former and its present use, it was no unfit emblem of the place of torment reserved for the wicked, by the Jews called Gehenna. Of course, the sense is, that the latter offence would incur as much greater a punishment than the former, as burning alive was more dreadful than stoning, \&c.
22. As the former verse treated of ill timed and excessive anger, of hatred, and enmity, so this and the following enjoin love to our neighbour, and a placable spirit. And since the Pharisees reckoned anger, hatred, and calumny among the slighter offences, and thought that they did not incur the wrath of God, if sacrifices and other external rites were accurately observed; so here we are taught that external worship is not pleasing in the sight of God, unless it proceed from a meek and charitable spirit.

- dàn-dīpov] ' if thou, shouldst, or wouldst bring thy gift to the altar.' Пробф'́pos was a vax sol. de h. re. "Exes $\tau 1$ nard dou. It is not necessary, with most Commentators, to supply dj $\gamma_{\wedge} \lambda \eta \mu a$, since that is implied by the context. The same expression occurs at Mark xi. 25. \& Rev. ii. 4.

24. $\left.\delta \iota a \lambda \lambda d \gamma_{\eta} \theta_{l}\right]$ ' do thy endeavour to be reconciled with;' namely either by seeking pardon, or by granting it. Thus Philo de sacrificiis p. 841. says, that when a man had injured his brother, and, repenting of his fault, voluntarily acknowledged it, (in which case both restitution and sacrifice were required) he was first to make restitution, and then to come into the temple, presenting his sacrifice, and asking pardon.
















25. Here is inculcated the generat maxim of speedy reconciliation with an adversary. And this is illustrated by an example derived $\hat{e}$ re
 This is not so much a periphrasis for civónoov, as a stronger expression. So Luke xix. 17. t $\sigma \theta_{i}^{\prime}$
 fes properly an opponent in a suit at law ; but bere a creditor, who is about to become such, by suing his debtor at law. 'E $\nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ dं $\bar{\delta} \bar{\omega}$, 'in the way, namely to the Court, or to the Judge. For from Heinecc. Antiq. Rom. iv. 16. 18. we find that sometimes the plaintiff and defendant used to settle their affair by the uay, and then the latter who had been summoned to trial was dismissed. 'ranрéry, 'the official, or executor of the sentence of the Judge,' called by Lu. xii. 58. тра́ктеор.
26. dé $\dot{c} \theta \eta$.] The words rois d $\rho$ xaious which follow in the common text, have been rightly rejected by all the later Editors, since they are sound in few of the MSS., and are sanctioned by scarcely any Versions or Fathers; and we can far better account for their insertion than their omission. They are not in the Edit. Princ., and mere first introduced, on slender authority, by Erasmus.
27. yuvaixa] i.e. a married woman; which sense is required by the almost general use of

 muär. 'Eтıtvuia may, with Whitby, be defined "soch a desire as gains the full consent of the will, and would certainly terminate in action, did not impediments from other causes arise;"; which seems taken from Augustin de S. Domini, thus making the essence of the vice to be in the insention. So also thought many of the sages of Greece and Rome, from whom abundant citations may be seen in Wets. in loc., to which may be added the following. Max. Tyr. Diss. 33, 4., who says that, to prevent criminal action, the ooly sale expedient is $\sigma \pi \bar{\eta} \sigma a t$ tas $\pi \eta \gamma \dot{ } s^{\prime}$, кal

philosophers indeed maintained that there was a moral defilement adhering to lascivious thoughts. So Eurip. Hippol. 317. makes Phædra exclaim
 Similar sentiments, too, are found in the Rabbinical writers.
 thy right eye prove a stumbling block to thee,' 'occasion thee to stumble,' ' lead thee into sin.' Kuin. observes that the Hebrews were accustomed to compare evil desires, lusts, and pleasures with members of the body; for example, an evil eye denoted envy. Thus to pluck out the eye, and cut off the hand, is equivalent to crucify the fesh, Gal. v. 24., and mortify your members, Col. iii.'5. The sense therefore is: ' deny thyself what is even the most desirable and alluring, and seems the most necessary, when the sacrifice is demanded by the good of thy soul.' Some think that there is an allusion to the amputation of diseased members of the body, to prevent the spread of any disorder. The force of the phraseology in this passage is admirably illustrated by Tertulian, Augustin, and Chrysost. Why the right eye should be mentioned the Commentators have not told us. The reason must be, as I have observed in Rec. Syn., that the right eye was essentially necessary to the purposes of war, as it was then carried on. The sentiments contained in this passage are illustrated by Wets. from various passages of the Classical writers, especially Seneca Ep. 51. Projice quæcunque cor tuum laniant, que si aliter extrahi nequirent, cor cum illis evellendum erat. In this and numerous other such like passages scattered up and down in the Philosophers who lived after the promulgation of the Gospel, one may see a higher tone of morals than had been before found, and which can be ascribed to nothing but the silent effect of the Gospel, even on those who refused to receive it.
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28. ös $\hat{\alpha} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi)^{2} \hat{c} \sigma y, \& c c$.] We are to bear in mind that the Jews were permitted to divorce wives without assigning any cause; that Jesus neither here nor at Matt. xix. 3. meant to give political directions; and that be, moreover, did not contradict Moses, who not even himself approved of the arbitrary divorces of his times (See xix. 8.) ; finally, that the Jewish Doctars in the age of Christ were not agreed on the sense of the passage of Deut. xxiv. 1., which treats of divorce. Now those of the school of Hillel said that the wife might not only be divorced for some great offence, but for 727 ל $2 \boldsymbol{y}$ кат Täбav altiau, for any cause however slight, so that a writing of divorcement were given to her. On the other hand, that of Shammai contended that ערות דבו could only mean someshing criminal as adultery. See Selden de Ux. Heb. iii. 18. Lightf. Hor. Heb. \&c. From the words of Christ, xix. 3., compared with Matt. x. 2. seg., it is clear that Moses meant the words to be taken as those of the school of Hillel interpreted them; and yet it is plain from Matt. xix. 8. \& Gen. ii. 24. that Moses did not approve of arbitrary divorce. The Jewish Doctors, however, changed a moral precept into a civil institution. Jesus, therefore, who did not intend to give political directions, here teaches in what case, salva religione et conscientiA, a wife might be divorced. (Kuin.) The word árográatoy (equivalent to $\beta_{1} \beta \lambda i ́ o \nu$ dтoorariou at xix.7.) is not found in the Classical writers. But we may compare
 a form of a writing of divorcement.
29. ropvelas.] The Commentators and Jurists are much divided in opinion as to the exact sense of this term. It is generally interpreted adultery. That, however, would require $\mu$ os Xcía, and as adultery was a capital offence, it would seem unnecessary to ordain divorce against such as were found guilty of it. Some understand by it fornication before marriage. Others, incest. And Mr. Morgan, in his learned and able work on Adultery and Divorce, religious apostacy, or idolatry. Aóyov. Here there is no such redundancy, per Hebraismum, as many Commentators suppose. This use of $\lambda$ 'ó $o$ os, which is found also in the Classical writers, is taken from forming accounts. So we say on the score of.
30. The Pharisees distributed oaths into the serious, and the slighter, and forbade perjury only when the name of God was contained in the oath; but when it was omitted, they held it
none, or a very slight offence; as also mental prevarication by swearing with the lips, and disavowing the oath with the heart. Hence neither they nor their disciples abstained from the use of vain oaths. Now it is this evil custom, which directly led to perjury of the worst sort, that Jesus here means to prohibit. He is, therefore, not to be understood as forbidding judicial oaths, bui (as appears from the examples he subjoins) such oaths as are introduced in common conversation, and on ordinary occasions.

- oùk étropкricets.] 'Eлtopкeiv may mean either to swear falsely, and not ex animo ; or, to violate one's oath. Both however are here to be understood. The words droisicets d\&.... $\sigma$ ou are to be taken (like ós $\delta$ 'à dy фovévoy, \&c. at ver. 19.) as an interpretation of the Jewish Doctors. Thus there will be an easier connexion between the doctrine of the Pharisees expressed in these words, and the opposite one of Christ. (Kuin.)

34. seq.] Here are instanced the oaths most frequently used by the Jews. From the numerous examples adduced by Wets. it appears that the heathens often swore oaths very similar to those of the Jews.

- $\left.\dot{\varepsilon} \nu_{\text {. }}\right]$ Heb. $工$ per, by. The difference between the Classical and the Hellenistic construc-
 Accus. or Genit. with $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha}$; the latter, a Dat. with $\dot{E \nu}$, and sometimes, though very rarely, els with an Accus., as at ver. 35.
 Marimi; as Ps. xlvii. 3. xlviii. 2. \& 3. xcv. 3. Job xiii. 9. \&c. "The antient Arabs. (says Schulz.) called God simply the King."

36. où סúvaбat-notȳซal.] There is something here at which many modern Interpreters have stumbled; insomuch that some would read, from
 vav. Others (ap. Wolf. et Koecher,) and recently Kuin. and others, attempt to remove the difficulty by thus interpreting: "thou canst not produce or bring forth one hair, white or black.' This, however, is doing violence to the position of the words, and yields a somewhat jejune sense. There seems to be no reason to abandon the interpretation of the antient, and most of the modern Interpreters, who understand it of change of colour. There is an ellipsis of eivat. The sense is, "thou hast not power even over the colour of thy hair, to make one hair otherwise than what it is, whether white or black.' This is seemingly a proverbial expression.










37. yal ya[- ov oũ] Most Commentators regard this expression as a kindred one to that in fames r . 12.; and take the first val and oi to siznify the promise, or assertion, the second its

 Rer. i. 7. and 2 Cor. i. 18. \& 19. See also Maimonid. cited by Wets. Thus the adverb will be converted into a noun; which is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. The above method, however, does violence to the plain words; and the passages cited are of another kind. It is therefore better, with Chrysostom, Kuin. and Fritz. to suppose that the pal and of are repeated, by way of expressing seriousness and gravity ; q.d. 'be content with a solemn and serious affimation, or negation.'

- ix toü movnpoü éoruy.] It is debated whether the sense be, ' the evil one,' or 'evil.' The Article will here (as Middlet. observes) determine nothing, because the neuter adject. may be used as a substantive; and so $\tau \delta$ mov ${ }^{2} \rho \dot{\rho} \nu$ at Rom. xii. 9. Yet as the former sense is supported by the words of Christ himself at Joh. viii. 44., and in the Lord's Prayer; and as there is every reason to think it was adopted by the antients, it deserves the preference. We may render; 'springs from the temptation of the Devil. This sense, indeed, in some measure, includes the other; but not vice versâ.

38. $\delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu \nu-\delta \delta \delta_{v i o s .] ~ T h e ~ C o m m e n t a t o r s ~}^{\text {a }}$ bere generally suppose an ellipsis of $\delta \omega^{\circ}$ cets. But thet is too arbitrary; and alyat, with an accormodation of sense, is preferable. There is a reference to the lex talionis, which, according to the law and the customs of the Jews, was left with individuals. A similar, and even more eevere law had existed in the very early periods of Greece and Rome, as in all barbarous stages of society; but the right of avengement was afterwards transferred to the magistrate.
 like the Syr. and Arab. १ 7 ri, not only signifies to sithstand, but (from the adjunct) to retaliate upon; Gratz., Kuin., and Schleus. adopt that pepse here. This, however, is taking too great a tiberty with the leading sense of the words. It is better, with others, to explain diviafyival, it oret oneself in a posture of hostile opposition, in order to retaliate. T Tā movnppu is put for a macculine; the injury for the injurious person, the injurer, (See Glass Phil. Sacr. p. 418.) as the Seph. render yen by diticivy as well as Tovepors. Moral maxims similar to the above are adduced from the Philooophers.

- janicet.] The word (at least according to its use in the later writers) corresponds to our rap and slap; and was chiefly, as here, used of striking on the face; which was regarded as an affront of the worst sort, and was severely punished woth by the Jewish and Roman laws. The expression here used was, no doubt, a proverbial one, and, like most such, must be understood cum granu salis; as a similar expression which occurs in the Latin writers ora prabere contumeliis. It has reference also, in a great measure, to resistance to a superior force. See the passages cited from Juvenal, Seneca, Aristotle, and others, in Rec. Synopt.
 Kuin. and others, that кpip, is here to be taken in a figurativesense, of rude brawling, disputing, \&c.; though the word is sometimes so used. As so the proof founded on the similar use of the Heb. $1 \cdot 7$ and $m$, which words are expreseed in the Sept. by kpiveotat, it is very weak. It is better, with almost all Interpreters antient and modern, to take кpı $\theta \bar{\eta} \nu a!$ in its proper sense, as a forensic term signifying to be impleaded at law ;'
 where see my note: Odourt is said by the Commentators to be redundant ; but the word is scarcely ever such, and here means 'should wish.' It is, indeed, necessary to the sense of the next clause. By xırīva is denoted the under garment; and by fuditov the upper. The latter was much more valuable than the former. Aaßeĩy is said to be for aipect. But if кpıөйעai be taken in a forensic sense, that mode of taking it is not necessary.

41. $d \gamma \gamma a p \in i \sigma e t$ \&c.] This verb is taken from the term dyyapos, i. e. a King's Courior, who had authority to press horses and carriages, either for the post, or for the public service, and, when necessary (especially in the latter case) the personal attendance of the owners. See Herodot. viii. 98. Xen. Cyr. viii. 6, 17. Joseph. Antiq. xiii. 3. The term was derived from the Persians, who first introduced the use of Couriers, to transmit intelligence. A custom in use among the Romans, who exacted this service from the provincials. Thus the words may be rendered: 'if any one shall impress thee, (i. e. thy horses \&c.) for a mile' \&c.
42. סave[ $[\sigma a \sigma \theta a t]$ The word signifies to borrow, with or without usury. Here the latter must be meant, because usury was forbidden by the Jewish law. It does not, however (as Kuin. supposes) imply the non-payment of the rum borrowed, for in that case it would have been said, not lend, but gire.
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43．$\tau \delta \nu \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i o \nu]$ The term was by the Jews used exclusively to denote their own people． And although in the passage of Scripture here alluded to（Levit．xix．18．）it is not expressly added＂thou shalt hate thine enemy，＂yet the Jews thought it deducible from the words $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \pi \dot{\eta} \sigma e \iota s \tau \dot{\delta} \nu \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota \nu$ ，and countenanced by the precepts concerning the idolatrous nations around them；which precepts they extended to all heathens，whom，it seems，they emphatically termed their enemies．On the enmity borne by the Jews to all other nations see the Classical illustrations in the Recens．Synop．
 will towards your enemies；＇implying a dispo－ sition to do them good，and that（as Chrys． observes）not inasmuch as they are enemies，but as being fellow creatures．The above view of the force of di $\gamma$ anâre（brought forward in Recensio Synop．） 1 find confirmed by Tittmann Spec． Lex．Synom．N．Test．mir．p．5．The words fol－ lowing are meant to explain and exemplify what is meant by $\dot{d} \gamma a \pi a \hat{T} \tau$ ．
－eiरoyeite］This is generally interpreted ＇wish them all manner of good．＇But that sense cannot well be extracted from the word．It is， better explained by others＇bene precamini iis．＇ But the most simple，and perhaps the true interpretation is that of Kuin．，＇bene iis dicite，＇ ＇give them good words．＇Kazapẫoaı may very well be understood of reviling in general．So at 1 Cor．iv．12．$\lambda o t o \partial o \rho \epsilon i \nu \quad$ and $\epsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda o \gamma$ Eiv are simi－ larly opposed．There seems，indeed，to be a beautiful climax in the clauses of this verse．
－тois $\mu \iota \sigma o \bar{u} \sigma \nu$.$] This all the Editors from$ Mill downwards are agreed is the true reading． It is found in the Edit．Princ．，and has been received into the text by Griesb．，Matth．，and Fritz．The common reading，toùs $\mu$ цбoüvzas， was first introduced，on very slender authority， by Erasmus，and，together with almost the whole of the rest of his text，received by Stephens into his third Edition；but very uncritically，for it is one of the Hellenistic idioms to use the Dative after кa入coss moteì for the Accus．，which is the Classical usage．See Winer＇s Gr．Gr．§24．i． 6. The same difference subsists with respect to

 to injure any one either by words or deeds．But insult is the leading sense of the word．And when it denotes injury by deeds，it is injury accompanied with insult．Els．and others would take the word in a forensic sense，to bring a false accusation，as in 1 Pet．iii．16．and occasionally
in the later Greek writers．This，however， seems straining the sense．The recent Com－ mentators are almost universally of opinion that it denotes injury by deeds，as passing from injury by words．Perhaps，however，it is best to take it of insult and abuse，and to suppose injurious action included in the general term ótónw．
45．viol tovi $\pi a \tau p o \delta s$ ］i．e．＇assimilated to him by conformity of disposition，＇as children usu－ ally are to their parents．See Joh．viii． 44.
 used in a Hiphil sense for＇causeth to rise．＇An idiom not unfrequent in the Classical writers． Many parallel sentiments are adduced by Wets． and others from the Classical writers，（See Rec．Synopt．）some possibly borrowed，directly or indirectly，from the New Testament．＇Bpéxec． It is agreeable to the Classical usage to join $\delta \theta$ eds or Zeis to yel，and sometimes other words of similar signification，as those denoting to thunder or lighten．
 very frequent ellipsis of $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu=\nu$ ．＂Exєтe．This is
 the sense is，＇have ye laid up in the word of God．＇ See v．12．\＆vi．1．And so in Thucyd．i． 129.
 which，though found in most of the MSS．，is doubtless from the margin．Teो $\bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu} a t$ ．On these see the writers on Jewish Antiquities，or Horne＇s Introduction．

47．$\dot{a} \sigma \pi a ́ \sigma \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ］．This denotes（species for genus）the exercising of all offices of kindness and affection．＇A $\bar{\delta} \in \lambda$ фou＇s．Almost all the MSS．， with the Edit．Princ．and other early Editions， together with many antient Versions and Fathers， have $\phi$ inous，which is preferred by Wets．，and received into the text by Matth．The common reading was adopted，from the Erasmian Editions， by Steph．，on slender MS．authority．Yet it is so strongly supported by Critical probability， that it requires little；$\phi$ ĩous being，as Grot．and others have seen，evidently a gloss．＇A $\delta \in \lambda \phi o \dot{s}$ signifies countrymen．
 pre－eminent ？＇Comp．ver．20．The passages here cited from the Classical writens by the Commentators are little to the purpose，except Eschin．Socr．Dial．mi．6．тà $\pi \in \rho \iota \tau \tau a$, as op－ posed to $\tau \alpha$ кoiva．．So here we might explain
 taken absolutely；e．gr．in Thucyd．iii．55．oudev
 той $\pi \rho є ́ \pi о \nu т о s$.
For te入civat some MSS．，Versions，and Fa．










thers have e $\theta$ viol, which is edited by Knap., Griesb., Fritz., and Tittm. And indeed the antithesis favours it. Yet, in so irregular a style as that of the Gospels, that is no certain ritenon. Besides d $\theta$ yucol might arise from a wish to improve the antithesis; and probably did, as the two or three MSS. which have it, are full of such emendations. I have, therefore, with Wets. and Math., retained the common reading ; the MS. evidence being next to nothing, and that of the

48. igeotc] Fut. for Imperat., the Commenttons tell us. Nay Abresch. affirms that $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \in \sigma \theta e$ is equally Imperative with sore. But it is more correct to say, that it bears an affinity to the Imperat., and (as Fritz. has suggested) is a delicate way of signifying what is directed to be done. Nor is this a Hebraism; but it is found both in Greek, Latin, and English. See Meth. Gr. Gr. $\$ 404$. The sense is, 'you must be, are required to be te入ecol.' It is obvious that the precept must be taken with limitation; the moaning being, that we are to aim at that perfection, especially in acts of benevolence to our fellow creatures, (here especially had in view, as appears from the parallel passage at Lu. vi. 36.) which pre-eminently characterizes the Deity. Nor is this limitation arbitrary, but is suggested by ఉ̈arep, which, like some other adverbs of comparison, does not denote equality in the things compared, (e. g. Math. xix. 19. di clarity ; q. d. 'in the same manner, though not in the same degree.'

 mordvin. All the recent Editors except Math. are agreed in reading $\delta \iota \kappa \alpha L o \sigma u ́ v \eta \nu$, instead of il $e$ en ., which has the appearance of a gloss. Our Lord, it is urged, first lays down a general precept ; and then specifies the particulars. But strong reasons are urged by Wets. why this reading cannot be admitted; e. gr. qui justè
 Tiny dusacooíy $\nu$. And it is so very deficient in authority that, with Match., I cannot venture to receive it. It were strange that a gloss, where nose could well be expected, should creep into almost every MS. Besides the quarter from whence we receive this reading is one fruitful in corruption under the guise of emendation. May we not, then, suspect that alteration was made, to introduce the very regularity above adverted to, though it is little agreeable to the unstudied
style which so generally prevails in the New
 occurs in Sirach vii. 10. Tob. xii. 10. and Sapient. xxxv. 2.
 See Math. ix. 17. 2 Cor. xi. 16. Though there can scarcely be said to be an ellipsis, since in use, writers seem to have had in mind otherwise. "EXere is not put for the Fut., but is to be taken as at v. 46. where see Note.
2. $\left.\mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \alpha \lambda i \sigma \eta \xi\right]$ The common notion that this has reference to the Pharisees having a trumpet sounded before them, when they distribated their alms, is justly exploded by the best Commentators; since there is no vestige of such a custom in the Rabbinical writings. We may, with Chrys., Euthym., and Theophyl., take the verb in a metaphorical sense, of ostentation in giving; with reference to the custom common to all the antient nations, of making proclamaions $\& \mathrm{c}$. by sound of trumpet. It was doubtless a proverbial saying. There is no reason, with Beza, Guin., and others, to take the verb in an active sense.

- oi نेँокрıтal] The word properly denotes 1. a stage player; and, (as such wore masks,) 2 dly , one who acts under a musk, a dissembler. इvvaywoais. Grot.,Wolf,Elsn.,Kuin.,and others take the word of places of public concourse, to the exclusion of synagogues. But those must surely be included as being the places where
 It is not for $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\epsilon}$ covet, as many Commentators explain; but the Present is taken of what is customary. It is, moreover, for $\dot{\alpha} \pi \boldsymbol{i} \lambda a \beta=\hat{o} \sigma \iota$; a use found also at Phil. iv. 18. Lu. vi. 24. and often in the later Greek writers, always with an Accusal., or at least in an active sense. Some render 'fall short of.' But that sense would require the Genit. Fritz. thinks there is here an intensive force in dंबéxovar ; q. d. 'they have the whole of their reward.' The sense is, 'they receive their reward, all that they seek, or will ever have.' So Lu. vi. 24. dंт́́єєте tiv тapá$\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\text { vi }}$, $\bar{\nu} \nu$.

3. $\mu \eta$ ㄱ $\gamma \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \tau \omega-\sigma o \overline{]}]$ A proverbial saying impporting such secrecy as to escape as it were the observation even of ourselves. Several similar sayings are cited from the Rabbinical and Classical writers. Of the latter none is so apposite as a passage of Epictet.iii. 2. where the Philosopher, exposing the folly of one who does nothing but out of regard to the public view, adds (possibly, with an eye to this passage) : $d \pi \dot{\epsilon} \chi \in i s \quad \ddot{\alpha} \pi a \nu \tau \alpha$.
b Iuc． 14 14.















 Most Commentators take this for oyces，thus silencing the word．But it appears from Scrip－ ture and the Rabbinical writers that the Jews used to pray standing．There is，however，no stress to be laid upon èorētes，and we might render：＇they love to stand praying＇\＆c．This sense，indeed，a various reading gives more plainly；but it is doubtless from the margin．「 $\omega \nu i a t s \tau^{2} \tau \bar{\nu} \pi \lambda a \tau e c \bar{\omega} \nu$ ，i．e．the corners made by the meeting of streets，where there is a broader space and greater concourse of passengers．
6．тameĩov］This is explained by Kuin． ＇an upper chamber，＇sometimes called $\dot{\sim} \pi e \rho \bar{\omega}$ חע，appropriated to retirement and prayer． Fritz．however，with reason，thinks the two should not be confounded，and that by тaцкioy is denoted a yet more retired and secret place． See Vitringa de Synag．Jud．p． 151.
 in the Classical writers ；but from what follows， and from the cognate term $\beta a \tau \tau o \lambda o y^{i} a$, occur－ ring in Suid．and Hesych．，we ascertain it to be the using of prolix useless speech，a dealing in
 strungers，as opposed to ov，the people of God．
 of the Heathen prayers．But if we may judge by their hymns，as we find those of Homer，Orpheus， and Callimachus，they were so stuffed up with synonymes，epithets，and prerogatives of the Deity，as to justify these expressions $\beta a \tau \tau 0 \lambda$ oyém and тоди入oyia．＇Ey，for ded or évecka；a use not confined to the Hellenistic，but occurring in the Classical style．
9．oürcos］＇in this manner，after this model．＇ This being，as Euthym．says，the fountain of prayer，whence we may draw precatory thoughts． Surely due reverence for a prayer which（as Wets．observes）contains all things that can be asked of God，together with an acknowledgement of his Divine majesty and power，and our subjec－ tion，requires that we should always include it in our prayers，especially as the words of Lu．xi． 2 ．
＂when ye pray，say，Our Father＂\＆cc．soem to contain an express command．This prayer，as we learn from Lu．xi．2．，was uttered at the request of one of Christ＇s disciples，who entreated that a form of prayer might be given them，such as John had delivered to his disciples，which， indeed，was commonly done by the Jewish Mas－ ters．The whole of it，with the exception of the clause＇as we forgive our debtors，＇is in subtance found in the nineteen prayers of the Jewish Liturgy．
－ォáre $\rho-$ oi $\rho a \nu o i r]$ These words are expres－ sive of the deepest reverence；and the dy rois oupayois implies all the attributes of that glo－ rious Being who inhabiteth heaven，－but whom the Heaven of Heavens cannot contain；－namely， his omnipresence，omniscience，infinite holinees \＆c．
 Oyoua is here，as often in Scripture，put for the person．This is accounted a Hebraism ；but a few examples（perhaps of a different nature）are adduced from the Classical writers．＇Aytag－ $\theta_{i} \tau \omega$ ，＇may it be worshipped and adored，＇do $\xi$－ a $\sigma$ 而itco，as Chrys．explains．
 that the Christian dispensetion（see Matt．iii．2．） may be completely promulgated over the face of the earth，by the coming in of the Jews and Gentiles，so that all being members of God＇s kingdom on earth，may finally be partakers of his kingdom of glory in Heaven．
－$\gamma \in \nu \eta \theta \eta i \tau \infty \quad \tau d \quad \theta \lambda \eta \mu a-\gamma \bar{n} s$ ］＇may the dis－ pensations of thy Providence be acquiesced in by us on earth with the same willing alacrity that they are obeyed in heaven．＇From this view of the sense，I have，with Fritz．accented the бov，as it is emphatic，and cannot therefore be an enclitic ；and so also just before．At dre $\pi \bar{j} \mathrm{~s} \gamma \bar{n} \mathrm{~s}$ there is thought to be an ellipsis of ovi－ Toos，which is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers．Fritz．however，and Winer deny that there is any ellipsis，the oürou being suggested by the кal，etiam．












4. derov] This word, like the Heb. onh, denoted necessary food of all sort. Some here inclade clothing, comparing James ii. 16. Tג drivideca roù бє́jacos.'. That, however, is not so much signified as implied. 'Extoürov. On the sense of this, Commentators are by no means agreed; the difficalty being increased by the term being unknown in the Classical writers, and occurring no where in the Scriptural ones but here, and in the parallel passage of Lu. xi. 3 . Hence we are compelled to seek its sense from its etymology, which admits of several derivations, though not any one quite satisfactory. The only two interpretations that have any semblance of truth are the following. 1. That of Salmas., Grot., Kuster, Fischer, Valck., Michaelis, and
 and as equivalent to els ajppoy. This derivation, however, is contrary to analogy; not to say that it seems at variance with our Lord's command at ver. 25. and 34, to ' take no thought for the morrow' and yields a sense harsh and far-fetched. 2. That of almost all the antient Fathers and Commentators, and, of the moderns, Beza, Mede, Toup., Kuin., Schleus., Rosenm., and Matthæi, by which deriving the term from ouvia, the sense will be, 'food sufficient for our support.' The above Commentators compare some Classical passages, of which the only apposite one is He -
 tpoфri. To which may be added Thucyd. i. 2.

 it only as it was brought, by the day."
 rias in the parallel passage of St. Luke. This mage of the word (with which the Commentalors compare the Heb. חוב to ove, and to $\sin$,
 arises, as Fritz. says, from this, that any one who commits sin, thereby contracts a kind of debe or obligation, to be paid by suffering the punishment awarded to it. 'Aфtevat signifies to remit the penalty, to forgive. So the Chaldee
 tors are agreed that wis here signifies for, or since; a signification frequent in the Classical writers, and confirmed by ver. 14 and 15 , and the parallel passage in Luke.
 and the best modern Commentators are of opinion
that this expression, (in some degree formed on Hebraism, imports: Suffer us not to be led into, abandon us not to, temptation,' i.e. (by implication, ) so as to be overcome by it. Toû novipoù. It is debated whether the sense here be evil, or the evil one, Satan, from the temptation of Satan. The evidence for the latter sense greatly preponderates, particularly as it is found in the Jewish formularies, from whence this clause is derived.

- $\partial$ วt $\sigma o \hat{1}$ \&c.] The gemuineness of this doxology has been called in question. But the evidence for it is, upon the whole, stronger than that against it. Besides its simplicity, propriety, and sublimity, its being found in nearly all the MSS., the Syriac, and other antient Versions, and supported by the greater part of the Greek Fathers, must forbid its expulsion from the text. And as to its not occurring in St. Luke, Lightf. and Whitby have very probably conjectured that the prayer was delivered on two occasions, on one of which the doxology was pronounced, on the other omitted.
 more impressively recommend the virtue just mentioned, our Lord (in the Hebrew mode, see Is. xxxviii. 1. iii. 9. Jer. xxix. 11. Deut. ix. 7.) propounds the same sentiment both affirmatively and negatively. (Kuin.) See Sirach xxviii. 2.

16. öтay de v $\boldsymbol{\text { п }}$ oreúnte] This is meant, not of public and enjoined, but of private and voluntary fasting. On both which see Horne's Introd. Vol. iII. p. 324. note, and p. 378. Mir riveoteoxv $\theta \rho \infty \pi$ of, ' do not put on a morose countenance.' ExvӨpoumds properly signifies scowling. The words imoкрıтal and $\sigma \kappa v \theta \rho \infty \pi \pi$ ol are conjoined in some passages cited by Wets. and others. 'Aфavi!oval, 'they disfigure.' 'Aфа$\nu$ IYetv signifies 1. to cause to disappear; 2. to change the appearance of, deform. The term has reference to the filthy appearance which the Pharisees affected, by the sprinkling of ashes and earth on their heads, and letting their beard
 has the Middle force, 'that they may appear unto men to fast.' Tois d $\alpha$ טpoinous is not, as
 Wets. compares Aristoph. Ran. 1095. ग́áкe'
 etva.

 $\nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{v} \omega \nu, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\psi} \pi a \tau \rho \dot{i}$ бov $\tau \hat{\psi} \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\psi} \kappa \rho \nu \pi \tau \hat{\psi}$ каi $\dot{\circ}$
 фауєрчิ.]
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17. $\left.\boldsymbol{a} \lambda_{\epsilon} \iota \psi a i-v i \notin a_{l}\right]$ i. e. appear as usual ; for the Jews regularly washed and anointed, except at times of mourning and public humiliation.
 agreed that these words (which are not found in many MSS., Versions, and Fathers, nor in the Editio Princeps and other early Editions) are not genuine, but introduced from ver. 4 and 6.
 signifies a repository for valuables; but sometimes, as here, the treasure itself, and such precious moveables as are usually treasured up; e. gr. gold, silver, \&c., either in the mass, or worked up into vessels, also costly apparel, in which the riches of the antients chiefly consisted.
 $\lambda_{\epsilon i a} \kappa \alpha{ }_{\eta} \dot{a}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda_{\eta} \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \kappa \in \eta^{\prime}$. To these two last the words following chiefly allude; for $\beta \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma$ ts (commonly understood of rust and canker, but better explained by Rosenm. and Kuin. of the curculio or corn-worm) may be taken in its most extensive sense, with Chrys., Euthym., and Fritz. to denote that corruption to which goods of every kind are subject. Finally, $\theta_{\eta \sigma \alpha \nu \rho}$. has reference to grain stored up in huge repositories chiefly
 $\Delta \iota o p \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma o v \sigma t$, scil. тdע тoĩxov, which word, or olkiav, is generally supplied. The walls in the East being chiefly of hardened clay, the houses are very liable to be thus violated.
 usual to interpret $\delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu \dot{\delta} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda$ oùs 'a liberal person;' and $\dot{\delta \phi} \theta a \lambda \mu d s \pi o \nu \eta \rho \delta \delta$, 'a covetous one;' which has been thought to be required by the preceding and following words. And several phrases in the Sept. and New Testament and the Rabbinical writers are adduced, to countenance this mode of interpretation. Yet it involves some confusion; and the words $\dot{\varepsilon} \dot{T} \nu$ oùy- $\phi \bar{\omega} s$ may be better taken, with Chrysost.:Theophyl., Euthym., and others among the antients, and most of the recent Commentators, in sensu proprio; and $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda o u ̈ s ~ i n t e r p r e t e d ~ s a n u s, ~ i n t e g e r, ~ c l e a r . ~ M o \nu n-~$ pos, depraved, sickly, dim ; of which significa-
tion many examples are adduced by Kypke, and Elsner. By $\tau \dot{d}$ ф $\bar{\omega} \mathrm{s} \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ gol is meant the mind and conscience. So, among the passages cited by the Commentators, Philo: ónep voüs iv
 well observed by Olearius, that the whole passage is adagial; of which the first part forms the adage: "The eye is the light of the body.". 2. The deduction, by consequence; "If then thine eye be healthy and clear" \&c. 3. The application: "If therefore the light (or what should be so) in thee be darkness, how great must be that darkness."
24. oúdeis- $\delta o u \lambda e \dot{e} \epsilon i \nu]$ It is implied by the context, that the two masters are of contrary dispositions, and give contrary orders. The words $\mu$ гбeìv and $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \pi \bar{a} \nu$ are to be taken in a qualified sense, to signify to love less, or love more; of which there are many examples both in the Sept. and the New Testament. 'Avtéxeöal is a stronger term than $\alpha \gamma \alpha \pi \bar{\alpha} \nu$, as denoting close connection and strict attachment. The difference here between the Classical and Scriptural use is, that in the former $d \nu \tau \dot{\chi} \chi \in \sigma \theta a l$ is used with a Genit. of thing, not of person, as here. The reason assigned by Middlet. for the omission of the Article at $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta$ s is too far-fetched. It seems to have been omitted simply because, having been employed in the other clause of the antithesis, it might be omitted without occasioning mistake. This could not have been done at toū $\dot{\epsilon} \tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho o v$, for a reason which will apply to the English as well as the Greek.

- Maرшш $\bar{\alpha}]$ This reading is found in most of the MSS. and many Greek Fathers, the Edit. Prin. and several early Editions; and is confirmed by the parallel passage of Luke, and by its derivation from the Chaldee and Syriac ממונו. lt has been received by Wets., Griesb., Matthei, and all other recent Editors. The word in Chaldee and Syriac signifies riches ; but, like the Greek $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ 入oüros, is here personified. As to its being an idol of the Chaldees corresponding to the Greek Plutus, that has been rather asserted than proved.


















 but，＇take no anxious thought，＇＇be not anxiously solicitous；＇as Phil．iv．6．$\mu \eta \delta \dot{d} \nu \mu \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \nu \bar{a} \tau \epsilon$ ，＇be anxious about nothing．＇And so in the parallel passage of Luke，$\mu е т е ш \rho i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ ，to be tossed with anxious cares．$\psi v \times \hat{\eta}$ and $\sigma \omega j \mu a \tau t$ are datives of cuuse．By $\psi v \times{ }^{\eta}$ is denoted life．The argument is：＇If God has given us life and bodies，surely he will not deny us the lesser blessings of food and clothing．＇MAeT̃ov is for meǐ̧óv，as supra，v．20，and inf．xii． $41 \& 42$.
 as Lake xii．24．T $\dot{\alpha}$ тєтєเvà тoū oùpavoū， סTper qu．This is supposed a Hebraism； since to the names of animals（Vorstius observes） the Hebrews were accustomed to subjoin the ptaces in which they usually lived．It was not， however，confined to the Hebrew，but occurs in the earliest Greek phraseology．So Hom．Il． p．675．ímoupavisuv тeтєєขшу，and Eurip．Elect．
 yuod，that，how．Kal，and yet，is called a Hebraism；but is also a Grecism．It may， however，here have the more usual force of but． Oix，for oixi．Māג入oy is not redundant，but an emphatic addition．The passages here cited by Wets．and others are not to the purpose． They might more appositely have adduced Thucyd．iv．3．$\chi$ copion dod́opov（excellent，） Mäд入ov écépov．
27．i $\lambda_{\text {axiav }}$ ］The antient Commentators and most modern ones take this to mean stature； which sense is ably maintained by Beza，Grot．， Elam．，and Fritz．Yet they only prove that it might be so taken，if a better sense were not at hand；namely that of atatis mensura．Now this is surely more appropriate；for the admonition is directed against excessive anxiety about food and clothing，which，though necessary to the preservation of life，have nothing in common with stature．And wixues，like other measures
of extent，is not unfrequently applied to duration of time．Those，however，who support this inter－ pretation are not agreed as to the nature of the metaphor．Most think there is an allusion to the allegorical fable of the Parcæ．Wets．supposes it alludes to a stadium or race－course，of which， as consisting of several hundred cubits，one cubit might not unaptly be termed $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \dot{\chi}$ готоv．

28．кат $\alpha \mu \alpha$ eтe］＇attentively survey．＇The ката is intensive，as in катєעоท⿱㇒日⿰㇇⿰亅⿱丿丶丶⿱⿰㇒一乂， 27．Kox $\iota \hat{a}$ and $\nu \dot{\eta} \theta \in \iota$ refer to the occupations of males and females respectively．

29．סó $\xi_{n}$ ］＇splendour．＇A sense frequent in the Sept．and New Testament ；but scarcely ever occurring in the Classical writers．

30．Xóptov］The Hebrews divided all vegeta－ bles into two sorts，$\gamma y$ and $ב ש y$ ，trees，and herbs ；the former of which were by the Hellenists called そú入ov；the latter，xópтos，comprehending both grass and corn，and likewise flowers，in－ cluding the lilies just mentioned，supposed to be the plant called the Crown Imperial．From scarcity of fuel，all the withered stalks of the herbage are in the East employed for that pur－ pose．（Grot．and A．Clarfe．）＇Oגıүо́тıбтоь， ＇$O$ ye of little faith，＇i．e．distrustful of the Pro－ vidence of God．
 often made use of in the Old Testament，in order， as it were，to shame the Israelites into virtue，by showing them that they lived no better than the unenlightened heathens．That they should have eagerly sought after such things，was not won－ derful，since they had no belief in or dependance on the Providence of God，and in their labours， or their prayers to the Gods，solely regarded temporal blessings．
－oide ，$\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$－dxáyrcov］Jesus here argues from God＇s knowledge，to his goodness．Your heavenly Father knoweth，and therefore will bestow them；i．e．on the supposition that ye ask
a Luc 6. 37, 38. P. 41.2. Rom. 2. 1. 10, 13. ${ }_{1} 10$ Cor. 13 4. ${ }^{1}$ Jac Jac. 4. 11, Marc. 4.24 b Luc. 6. 41.










for them, and are not otherwise unfit to receive them. (Markland.)
33. тท้ $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a \nu$ тoû $\theta \in o \tilde{u}]$ i. e. the religion promulgated by God, its promises and blessedness. Triv סıкatoбúvŋv a., i. e. that mode of justification which he hath revealed, and the righteousness and holiness which it requires; not that righteousness or system of morality which the Jews had devised, consisting chiefly of ceremonies and mere externals.
 Commentators take els Triv aüpiov for Ta els Triv aűpıov. Büt that is unnecessary. The els may very well denote object. Aópiov is taken for time to come in general. 'Apкerdy-aúrijs. These, like the words immediately preceding, have the air of an adage, similar to some adduced by Vorst. and Schoettg. The neuter in doкerdv is put, by an idiom common both to the Greek and Latin. And $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \mu \alpha$ or $\pi \rho \bar{a} \gamma \mu \alpha$ is understood. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 439. Tī $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{p} \rho a$. Some Commentators supply exdorv. But it is better to suppose the Article used with reference to $\pi \alpha \rho o v^{\sigma} \eta$, 'the (present) day.' Kaxla is well explained by Chrys. кdкшоєs, тa入aєжшрía. This sense is found in the Sept., but not in the Classical writers. The passage adduced from Thucyd. iii. 58. is not to the purpose.
VII. 1. $\mu$ भे кріvere-крьө̄̄тe.] Almost all Commentators take крivere for катакрivere, chiefly because in the parallel passage of Luke vi. 37. $\mu$ ท̀ катаঠıка́乌ете каl ой $\mu \eta$ катадıккабӨทีre is added. But Fritz. (perhaps with reason) prefers the interpretation of Chrysost., by which кplvere is taken of sitting in judgment over others, acting as severe censors of their faults. And катaducdy may be understood in the same way. One thing is certain, that forensic judgment cannot here be included.
2. dv © $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \rho i \mu a \tau \iota$.$] The d v$ is thought to be redundant. But it rather answers to the Heb. I, or, as Fritz. thinks, is to be taken in the sense per. See Matth. Gr. Gr. p. 842 . For
 unanimous consent of all Editors from Mill to Griesb. and Fritz. The other was doubtless derived from the parallel passage of Luke.
3. $\tau\{\delta \dot{\beta} \beta \lambda \dot{d} \pi c t s$.$] ' Why beholdest thou.' Or$
rather, I conceive, ' how beholdest thou,' ' how is it that thou,' \&c. Nearly the same mith xises in the next verse. B $\lambda$ énets carries with it, from the context, the sense of acutely seeing. K $\dot{\alpha} \rho \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\phi}$ is rightly explained by Grot., Brug., Kuin., and others (on the authority of Hesych. and Suid.) splinter, as opposed to doxdv, beam. There is reference to a proverb of frequent use with the Jews against those who were severe upon the slight offences of others, and were insensible of their own crimes. Many similar sayings are adduced both from the Rabbinical and Classical writers.
4. dфes, $\mathrm{e}^{\prime} \kappa \beta \lambda^{2} \lambda_{\omega}$.] The Commentators usually supply Iva. To this, however, Fritz. with reason objects, as unnecessery ; and compares the Latin permitte eximam. The Article in in doxds refers to the beam, as just mentioned. $\Delta i a \beta \lambda$ é $\psi$ ets, dispicies.
6. $\mu \dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\omega}$ тe-хoipos.] Lest any one should suppose all liberty taken away of judging even concerning matters the most manifest, Christ subjoins a precept fraught with that prudence which he elsewhere directs to be joined with simplicity. (Grot.) Here again we have two adagial sayings. Similar ones are adduced from the Rabbinical, and even the Classical writers, to which may be added the following from
 els tovis rpiódous. By dogs and svine are meant those profane and sensual persons who were so refractory and devoted to the lusts of the flesh, that so far from receiving the truth, when pro: posed to them, they resisted and blasphemed it, and impeded the prevalence of it. The reveries of some Commentators, who would take dytor to denote a portion of the flesh of a eacrifice thrown to dogs; or suppose the word in the Hebrew signified an ear-ring ; are alike undeserving of attention. It can only signify the doctrines of the Gospel. From the Rabbinical writers it appears that the Jews called the precepts of wisdom pearls. And our Lord more than once compares the truths (especially the more recondite ones) of the Gospel to the same. Thus in Matt. xiii. 46. the Gospel is compared to a pearl of great price.
 many Commentators, antient and modern, take
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катат. of the sxine, and $\sigma$ трафévтеs pingworv of the dogs, per Chiasmum, kal being taken for ow. This, however, is too harsh; and it is better, with Erasm., Pric., Wets., and Fritz., to refer both to the swine, orpooфévices having reference to the sidelong way in which hogs inflict their
 cor pedes, under foot ; but by Fritz., 'suis pedibus.' $7_{\text {. alreite- univ.] The same thing expressed }}$ in three seemingly proverbial forms. At кpoúere sub. Tyis $\theta$ ipay, in which term as well as dyoureiy the ellipsis was common.
 what is expedient and proper. T $\omega$ o $\kappa \rho o v o u r t$, i.e. who earnestly and with faith addresses himself in prayer. 'Ayocyทㅎacas, 'it will be opened.' The sense here is nearly that of the present, used to denote custom.
9. $\bar{\eta}$ тis $\dot{\mu} \nu$ р ротos.] The $\eta$ is thought by Pritz. to denote contrariety, 'an contrarium accedere solet:' But it has rather the illustrative force, when what follows is meant to illustrate the foregoing by another view of the subject. As to the ris, Elsn. and Fritz. rightly suppose an anceoluthon, by which two interrogations are blended; thus ' an quis est $e$ vobis homo, quem si filius panem poposcerit, num forte lapidem el porrigat?' 'A ${ }^{\prime}$ poosos, the best Commentators, antient and modern, agree is emphatical, making (as Campb. says) the illustration of the goodnees of the celestial Father, from the conduct of eren human fathers, with all their imperfections, mach more energetic.
11. arompol. The antients, and, of the moderns, Grot., Elsn., and Schoettg., explain this evil, corrupt; the recent Commentators, avaricious. But for the latter sense there is little or Do authority. The former is greatly preferable. The term is used by way of comparison with the celestial Father. Oidate dióvat. Almost all the rocent Commentators take this as said, per periphrasin, for diðore ; and adduce several pasages of the Classical writers, which, however, are not quite to the purpose. It seems better to regard it as a Hebramm, and a stronger expres. sion.
 cept, familiar to the Jews, and not unknown to the Gentiles, as the Philological Commentators have shown. The oũ is by some thought transi-
 oütco Fritz. strongly objects, urging that oüres would require wis à ; and cancels the oütuws. Here, however, we have popular diction; and to make alteration were uncritical. More may be said for the oüTows, which he edits, with Matth., from the Edit. Princ., and some MSS. and Versions) for oütos, just after. Yet the rule of preferring the more difficult reading must induce us to retan the vulg. The sense is, ' This is the sum and substance of what is contained in the law and the prophets [on the relative duties of men].'
 parallel passage at Lu. xiii. 24.) namely, els Tiv Goriv. The course of human action is often called in Scripture דיר obds; and consequently, from the restraints and difficulties of virtue, its road is termed strait; and that of vice, broad. Here, however, the comparison is to a gate opening into a road leading up to a citadel. Similar comparisons and parallel sentiments are found in the Heathen writers, as cited by Wets. See also Recens. Synop. The tīs implies another gate, to the broad road, which we are not to enter. The sense of the passage is this : 'Aim at entering in at the strait gate : though there be a gate that is broad, and the way to it broad, and many are travelling to it; yet it leads to perdition; therefore take it not. And though there be a gate that is strait, and the way to it narrow, and few are they that travel thereto; yet take it, for it leads to life and eterpal happiness.'
14. $\tau i$ orevij.] It is impossible to imagine stronger evidence than what there is for this reading, which has been received by all the most eminent Editors. The common reading may, indeed be tolerated, in the sense sed ; but Erasmus, from whom Stephens derived it, had little or no authority for it. Whereas $\tau i$ is supported by the great body of the MSS., all the best Versions, Chrys., Theophyl., and Euthrm., the Editi









1 Supr. 3. 10. Joh 15.2,



k Hos. 8.2.
Luc. 6. 46. Rom. 2.13.
Jac. 1. 22.






Princ., and some other of the earliest Editions. The sense, then, is 'how narrow is the gate.' 'Axáyovara. "Ayety is the regular term; yet dixay. occurs in Cebes p. 14.
14. ol éjpigкovecs.] Schleusn. explains consequuntur: a frequent use of the word. The expression seems meant (as some say) to suggest the difficulty and exertion necessary to attain it.
 I have exhorted you to enter in by the strait gate. But beware of false guides. (Newcome.) $\Pi_{\text {focéxes. }}$ when followed by dió tivos (with which Kuin. compares the Heb. שמר מן) is equivalent to фoßeĩrөat áлá rtvos. It occurs several times in the Sept., but never in the Classical writers. 'Eautoìs seems to be understood, which is expressed at Lu. xvii. 3. 廿evסom $о$ oф. here it is variously understood; but it is best taken
 T $\eta \mathrm{s}$ and $\pi \rho o \phi \eta \tau e \dot{v} e l \nu$ in the sense teacher and teach, are common. Some think the $\psi \in v \delta$. in $\psi$ evoorpoo. has reference to their doctrines; others, to their lives. Both may be supposed.
 and the Latin in, and our in, is often used with verbs of clothing, to denote the material of which the clothing is. The $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \dot{\partial} \mu a \sigma t$ $\pi \rho о \beta \dot{\alpha} \tau \infty \nu$ has reference to the $\mu \eta \lambda \omega 0 \pi \eta$ (sheep-skin, or sometimes a cloak made of the fleece roughly worked up ) with which the false prophets clothed themselves, and, as it seems, the false teachers among the Pharisees. "Aprayes. A common epithet used of wolves, as rapar in Latin, and ravenous in English.
16. карті̄̀.] i. e. manners and actions. A frequent figure. See Matth. iii. 8. I would com-

 adagial illustration.
17. $\sigma a \pi \rho d \nu$.] The word denotes primarily what is decayed and rotten; but 2 dly , by metonymy, what is refuse, and worthless, (as old vessels, and small fishes) also, when applied to
trees or fruit, what is of a bad quality. The passages adduced by Wets. will illustrate all these senses.
19. The best Critics are agreed that this verse is introduced, by interpolation, from Matt. iii. 10. The objection, however, that it impedes the course of reasoning, will be lessened, if we consider it as an awful admonition incidentally thrown in. See Newcome.
20. $\boldsymbol{a} \rho a \gamma \epsilon$.] Some Commentators take it for mávecos, profecto. But there is no reason to abandon the common interpretation, itaque, ergo. The Particle is conclusive, as in Matt. xvii. 26. xi. 18. The $\tilde{a}_{\rho a}$ in it is illative, and the $\gamma \in$ limitative. See Herm. on Viger. p. 821, 825, 827.
21. ov $\pi$ âs.] This is taken by the Commentators to mean no one. But though that interpretation is sanctioned by Chrys. and Euthym., there seems no sufficient reason to abandon the usual sense of ov rās. We have only to suppose the common ellipsis of $\mu$ óvov with $\delta$ тotồv. The sense is, ' Not all who with the lips acknowledge me as their Lord, will be admitted to the blessings which I come to bestow, but those only who likewise perform what my Father enjoins.: Kúpios is here and often elsewhere used for diodiokanos, being the name given by the Jews to their Rabbis.
 in the foregoing words, namely, at the period when there will be a final admission or rejection of all persons. In some other passages, however, as Matt. xi. 24., and Lu. x. 12., the pronoun may he understood as referring to some day well known ; that expression being, as appears from the Rabbinical writers, used emphatically of the day of judgment. ' $\mathbf{E} \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \sigma \omega \bar{\omega} \dot{\delta} \dot{\partial} \mu \alpha \tau \tau$, ' by thy power and authority.' See Lu. ix. 39. II poe$\phi \eta \tau e v i \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu$, 'have taught and preached the Gospel ;' not, however, excluding the ordinary sense prophesied. $\Delta v y \dot{\mu} \mu$ eis, miracles; by metonymy of cause for effect. An Hel' lenistic use.















1 VIII. KATABANTI $\delta_{\dot{\varepsilon}}$ aúvè à $\pi \dot{o}$ тoũ öpovs, $\dot{\eta} \kappa о \lambda o v ́-$


 openly and plainly.' A signification adduced by the Commentators from Rlian Var. Hist. ii. 4. Herodo. iii. 6. There is something not unlike this idiom in our own language. Oúdénote zyvay imās, i. e. 'I never, recognized you as my servants, or approved you.' This is considered a Hebraism; yThaving the sense approve. But some examples are adduced by Wets. from Greek writers ; not, however, quite to the point. Far more apposite is the example from Isæus adduced in Recens. Synop. Lì dè $\tau i s$ et; $\sigma o \imath$ de
 not recognise you) od $\mu \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ c $\sigma i \eta \mathrm{~s}$ тìv oikiay.
 'Epyayópevou Tiv dvomiav. The purity of the Greek is established by a passage of Themist. adduced, in Recens. Synop.: ol topa\}б́цevo dperify. 'Epy. is a far stronger term than moieiv, and signifies to do any thing studiously and habitually, to make a trade of it. The Art. here (at which Fritz. stumbles) has an intensive force; q.d. all kind of iniquity. See Middlet. Gr. A. v. ${ }^{2}$.
24. wâs ouv-autovs] This is regarded as a Hebrew construction for $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a$ oũv dкко́́боутaj joccioves dvopl. But it may be better called a popular construction, and a relique of primitive simplicity of diction. Thus it is found in He rodotus and all unstudied writers and speakers, in every language. The same may be said of tonei aürous, scil. तóyous, which is a popular phrase to denote, 'performing my precepts.'
 may, compare him.' Фро⿱ime, prudent, provident. The Commentators adduce as an exam-
 the force of the Art. here and at $\dot{d} \pi i=\tau i v \quad \alpha \mu \mu o \nu$ (which, however, cannot well be expressed in a iranslation) see Middlet. in loc.
25. $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ B $\left.\rho 0 \times{ }^{\eta}{ }^{i}\right]$ This denotes, like the Heb. Den, a heavy gush of rain (as we say.) $\mathbf{K} a \tau \epsilon \beta \eta$ is a vox sol. de h. re. The Art. is used, as commonly with the great objects of nature, both in Greek and English. Потаноl, the floods,
 The torrents of the East are indeed like rivers. кal, but; like the Heb. 7 .
26, 27. Many similar passages are adduced by Wets. from the Rabbinical writers.
 T $\bar{\eta} \delta \delta^{2} \delta a x \bar{n}$. The word may denote either the doctrine taught, or the manner of teaching, which Camp. adopts. But the former seems to be the principal sense intended; the latter is only secondary and implied.
 tators say. But the sense seems to be : 'he had been teaching,' or, 'he was teaching then', in reference to the customary and general character
 scil. тoù dıóáкאelv, 'as one having authority to teach,' i. e. self-derived power ; not as the Scribes, who rested only on that of their Doctors; as not the interpreter, but the maker of the law. Several illustrations of the phrase have been adduced by Wets. and others. See Recens. Synop.
VIII. 1. $\dot{\text { E }}$ ] The particle has the transitive sense, and the aütệ is redundant, populariter.
2. кal ldò̀] This expression serves for transition, as do many other similar formulas. On which see Wahl's Lexicon. Mporecuंvet. This is not to be taken as denoting an acknowledgement of the Divinity of our Lord; for the term was one expressive of civil adoration, and only paid to him as the Messiah, or a prophet sent from God. (Whitby and Wall.)

- кúpte] A form of address used by the Jews to those with whom they were not acquainted,


b Lev. 14. 3, 4, 10 .



c Luc. 7. 1.


 d Luc. 15. 19, 21.

(See Joh. iv. 19. xii.21. xx. 15.) as domine with the Latins, of which see examples in Wets. Yet as it was used by pupils, when addressing their masters, and was doubtless applied to Rabbis, (and the leper must have regarded Jesus at least as such) so it may here be taken in this view. 'Eà $\theta_{\epsilon} \lambda \boldsymbol{\eta}$, dóvagat. This appears from the examples in Wets. to have been a form of earnest and respectful address, especially used by those who sought for relief from physicians. Käapifat. A word used peculiarly of healing leprosy, and which has reference to the legal impurity supposed to be incurred by the disease, which could only be removed by the cure of the disorder.

3. éxreivas тì $\chi$ eitpa] There is here neither pleonasm nor Hebraism, as is commonly supposed. Nor is the expression devoid of force; though it may be regarded as a relique of the circumstantiality of antient diction. "H $\mathrm{H} a \tau 0$ aùdy, i.e. more Medicorum, says Wets., who adduces many examples of a similar use of the word. But our Lord seems to have touched the leper, both to inspire him with confidence, (as conceiving that unless with the power and will to heal him, he would have incurred pollution and possibly infection) and also to make the bystanders see that the cure was effected by his touch. Our Lord, in most cases, condescended to accompany his words by corresponding actions. As to Jesus's violation of the law, it must be remembered that works performed by Divine virtue were exempted from the ritual precepts.
4. $\mu \eta \delta \in \nu \backslash$ eimps] Sub. Yva. The best Commentators are agreed that the order was only meant to extend to the period when he had presented himself to the Priests, for examination. Considering the great multitude of bystanders, it was impossible to prevent the transaction from being made public; so that the object of the injunction must have been, to keep the officiating priest ignorant of the transection, that he might not maliciously deny the leper to be perfectly clean; which would disappoint the benevolent object of the miracle. It has been supposed (and not without reason) by some, as Lightf. and Newcome, that this transaction is placed here by the Evangelist (for certain reasons) out of its proper chronological order. Els raptúpion aürois. It has been debated whether aürois has reference to the priest, (i. e. the priests; lepeit being taken distributively) or to the people. Though there is some harshness in the latter, since the antecedent does not exist in the preceding context; yet propriety requires it; for
the offering could be no testimony to the priests. It may, however, be understood of both.
 Commentators are agreed that, from the striking similarity of circumstances between this transaction and that recorded at Luke vii. 1., they must be the same. The points of difference, they think, are very reconcileable; $\pi$ ais being both in the Classical and Hellenistic Greek often used for ooū̀os, servant; and so puer in Latin, and garcon in French. It is not, however, a term of affection, but used because such kind of services as are performed by our foutmen, or valets, was originally rendered by boys. Hence the name was afterwards retained, when a change was made in the person. And as to the Centurion here being said to solicit for himself what in St. Luke he intreats through the medium of his friends, it may be observed that the Jews, and in some measure the Greeks and Romans, were accustomed to represent what was done by any one for another, as done by the person himself. See Mark x. 15. compared with Matth. xx. 20. And though St. Matthew does not tell us that he was a proselyte, (as does St. Luke) yet he says nothing to the contrary. See Grot., Lightf, Kuin., and Fritz.

- $\left.\beta \epsilon \beta \lambda_{\eta} \tau_{\alpha i}\right]$ A term appropriate to sick per-
 is sometimes added. Whether it be rendered decubuit, with Kuin., or lecto affirus est, with Fritz., the sense is the same.
 from the examples cited by Wets., is often found with verbs denoting sickness. It is debated whether $\beta a \sigma a v i\}^{\circ} \mu « v o s$ should be rendered tormented, tortured, or afficted. For palsies, whether attended with contraction, or remission of the nerves, do not occasion any great pain. Yet it has been proved that, in one stage of the disorder, the patient suffers great agony; as also when it passes into an apoplexy. The sense tormented may be justified; though afficted will be the most cautious version. The word is rarely found beyond the Scriptural writers, except in Joseph. and Philo.

8. Lxayds] for akcos, as in Joh. i. 27. and Matt. iii. 11. The full force of this expression will depend upon whether he was a proselyte, or a heathen. It is not, however, necessary to refine so much as the Commentators have done. We may regard the words as constituting a formula expreseive of profound humility. $\Lambda \dot{6} y$ 甲. On this reading and airệ all the Editors from















Mill downwands are agreed，both from external and internal evidence．The two readings are foand in the best and greater part of the MSS．， Versions，and Fathers，as also in the Edit．Princ． and some other of the earliest Editions．As to the vulg．Tov $\lambda o \sigma^{\prime}{ }^{2}$ and $\tau \bar{\omega}$＇Ingoù，they were introduced on slender authority，by Frasm．， and，as unnal，adopted by Stephens in his third edition．The $\tau$＇$I$ is evidently from the margin ； and rov $\lambda$ dóyov arose partly from a confusion of the $v$ and $c$ adscript ；and partly from an igno－ rance of the phrase cimeiv $\lambda$ óye，which is like the Latin verbo dicere，and our say at a urord； here，gice order by a word．Finally sizeì $\lambda$ ó $ب$ ب eecurs in the parallel passage of Luke．
 mevos，which is expressed at Luke vii．8．and Diod．Sic．cited by Munthe．The Commentators say that $\dot{\text { Ej}}$ govoiav is used as abstract for concrete． It is not，bowever，quite necessary to resort to that principle here．＇I he sense is ：＇I am a man placed under authority，viz．the authority of my superior officer．This is an argument $a$ mineri ad majus；q．d．＇I who hold but a cabordinate office，can order my soldiers and servants；much more canst thou，who hast eapernatural ，power，suppress disorders，at thy absolute fiat．＇The words following are highly appropriate and picturesque．See the Notes of Wets．and Markf．

10．iv тé＇Iбparin］＇for the people of Israel；＇ as eftem in the Old and New Testament．But there is not，I conceive，as some suppose，an cllipeis of $\lambda d^{\circ}$ ，or oikep．IIiotıv．The word here denotes faith in its general sense，a firm reliance on the posoer of Jesus to work the miracle in question；a persuasion supposed to have ori－ grosted in the cure of the nobleman＇s son，at Cana，only a day＇s journey distant．
11．rodidol］Namely the Gentiles；for they were such as compared with the ivol ins $\beta a \sigma t-$
 Lake adds dxd Boppé kal Nótov．The expres－ sion，either complete or elliptical，is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers． Grat．thinks there is a reference to the promise made to Jacob，Gen．xxviii．14．＇Avaкдı日rj－
 $\kappa \in i \sigma \theta a t, \kappa a \tau a x \lambda i \nu \in \sigma \theta a t$ ，and others，adapted to the Oriental custom of reclining，not sitting，at table．Both the Scriptural，Rabbinical，and Classical writers（see the illustrations adduced by Wets．and others）represent the joys of heaven under the image of a banquet，\＆cc．，as adapted to the ordinary conceptions of men，and with refer－ ence to the common affairs of life．
 Israelites，for whom the happiness of that king－ dom was especially destined，and who had arro－ gated to themselves a place there，to the exclu－ sion of other nations．Kuin．remarks that vids， like the Heb．ב，is used to denote a person holding some kind of property in the thing signi－ fied by the noun in the Genit．，with which it is joined；as Luke x．6．viòs tîs cipývis．See also Joh．xvii．12，and Lu．x．6．ミкó́tos тd ÉEcitcoov．Compar．for superl．The expression denotes darkness the most remote from light， and（by an allusion to the image of a banquet） the farthest separated from the splendid lights of banqueting rooms．Some think，too，that there is an allusion to the dark and squalid subter－ ranean dungeons into which the worst malefactors were thrust．See the Classical illustrations in Wets．and Recens．Synop．
 is expressed by Middlet．thus ：＇there shall they weep and gnash their teeth．＇＇Oóóvtw is not， as some say，pleonastic；though the word is sometimes omitted in this phrase．Wets．com－ pares Juv．Sat．v．157．To which may be added a more apposite illustration from Soph．Trach． 1074．$\beta$ é $\beta \rho \cup \chi \alpha$ к $\lambda \alpha \alpha^{\circ} \nu$.

13．غ́̇катоvтápxy］In this reading Wets．， Matth．，Griesb．，Fater，and Fritz．coincide，for
 it is supported by the greater number of MSS．， and more agreeable to later Grecism．The ter－ mination－os in such words being the early，that in 一 $\eta \mathrm{s}$ ，the later termination，＇Ev Tị \＆ipg éкєívy， ＇at that very instant；＇for wo sometimes signi－ fies，not hour，but a point of time，time；as the Chald．and Syr．רנשע and Heb．
f Marc. 1. 29).
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15. $\eta \psi a \tau o]$ More medicorum, as appears from the Classical examples in Wets. And ádinرi is a usual term to denote the departure of a disorder. See Foesii Econ. Hippocr. The miracle here recorded did not consist in the cure of an incurable disorder, but in the mode of cure, instantly and by a touch. Dinкóvet, waited, or attended upon him. Camp. 'entertained him.' Others, 'waited upon him at table.' It seems better, however, to preserve the general sense. A $\dot{u} \tau \varphi \overline{0}$. On this reading almost all the Editors are agreed. It has every support from MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and is found in the Edit. Princ. and the two first of Stephens. Besides that, it is required by the context. The common reading duroís was introduced by Erasm., on very slender anthority, and was received by Steph., with all the other Erasmian readings, into his third Edition. Fritz., indeed, defends it, (and it is retained by Griesbach) but upon precarious grounds. It is plain that this deaкovia is mentioned as a proof of the completeness of the cure.
16. ó $\psi i a s]$ The Hebrews reckoned two ö $\psi$ ıac, the early, from the ninth hour to our six oclock or sunset, and the late, from sunset to nightfall. From Mark i. 32. it appears that the latter one is here meant. (Grot., Kuin., and Fritz.) Thus the sabbath (for we find by Mark i. 21. that it was a sabbath day) had ended when the sick were brought. Aore, ' at a word.' Fritz. renders ' sola imperii vi.' So the Latin verbo. See vii. 9. and Note. Observe that in the words following the casting out of dæmons and the curing of diseases are kept distinct.
17. aürds- $\beta \dot{a} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \alpha \sigma e \nu]$ The words are from Is. liii. 4., where are described the propitiatory sufferings of Christ for the sins of the world. And they are not to be supposed, with some Commentators, as cited by way of accommodation. Yet as the Jews considered dangerous diseases as the temporal punishment of sin, it may be supposed that the prophecy had a double fulfilment, first in the removal of corporeal maladies, and secondly in the remission of our sins, by the sacrifice on the cross. (Grot. and Whitby.) The verbal variation here between St. Matthew and the Sept. is ably reconciled by Ahp. Magee on the Atonement, Vol. i. p. 415. seqq. who refers $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta e v e i a s$ and the corresponding Hebrew word to bodily maladies, vórous; and its corresponding Hebrew term to diseases of the mind; the former
clause signifying Christ's removing the sicknesses of men by miraculous cures, the latter, his bearing their sins on the cross. The Unitarian perversion of the passage, whereby it is made to relate to the removal of diseases, without any reference to a propitiatory sacrifice, is completely refuted by Abp. Magee ubi supra. It is not surprising (he observes) that so distinguishing a character of the Messiah as that of his healing all manner of diseases with a word, should be introduced by the Prophet in a passage where his main object was to represent the plan of our redemption by means of Christ's sufferings ; especially as the Jews so connected the ideas of sin and disease, that an allusion to one must guggest the other. That the Evangelist, though speaking more immediately of bodily diseases, should at the same time cite the latter part of the prophecy, which relates to the propitiatory sacrifice of Christ, is equally reasonable, because the healing of bodily diseases would naturally suggest the more important object of the Messiah's mission, that of saving men from their sins."
 dape for dye入aße. This use of the word is frequent in the Sept. As to $\dot{d} \beta \dot{d} \sigma$., it cannot, as corresponding to the Heb. DבD, denote cured; without great violence. And to this Fritr. (a witness in this respect omni exceptione major) bears the strongest testimony. 1 would not, indeed, deny that $\beta a \sigma r \alpha\} e l \nu$ may signify to remove or cure, (for a passage of Galen cited by Wets. will (if it be not corrupt) prove this ; and our own idiom countenances it; but I see not how it can in the passage of the Prophet be so taken: and the language of the Evangelist may very weli be taken in the manner above mentioned. Of $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta$ éveıa in the sense disorder the Commentators adduce an example from Xen. Hist., to which may be added another from Thacyd. ii. 49. \&̈́roe divorov- ts $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda a s \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta e v e i \alpha s$.
 much because he was incommoded by the number of applicants for cure, as because Christ systematically avoided keeping a multitude long together, to prevent any suspicion of encouraging sedition. On els td Tepav see my Note on Thucyd. i. 111.
19. Eic] for Tis. A use thought by some to be a Hebraism; but adduced (as well as unus in Latin) from several of the later Greek writers.
















 warn him of the difficulties he would have to encounter in following so destitute a master； and may lead us to suppose that the scribe was desirous of becoming Christ＇s disciple，from temporal advantage only．\＄codeoùs，dens，or Lairs．Karaoknve日ress，denotes，not nests，（which would be yoorial）but places of shelter，under branches of trees or elsewhere，where birds settle and perch．
－$\dot{\delta}$ vide $\tau 0 \bar{u} \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \theta \rho \dot{\operatorname{com}}$ out This title，taken from Dan．vii．13．and Ps．viii．4．，and now first assumed by Christ，occurs sixty－one times in the Gospels，and always is used by Christ himself， never by any other person．It occurs once in The Acts，（vii．56．）and is employed by the martyr Stephen．On the origin and ratio of the appellation there are various opinions，which see detailed in Recens．Synop．Whatever those may be，it is clear，from the corresponding term $\dot{\delta} \dot{\nu} u$ os tout $\Theta e o u ̈$ ，that this title belongs to Christ act＇${ }^{2}$ Goxiv，and both taken together decidedly prove that Christ united in his person both the human and the divine nature，＂was very man and very God．＂Bp．Middleton observes that ＂in a variety of places in which our Saviour calls himself the Son of Man，the allusion is either to his present humiliation，or to his future glory ： and if this remark be true，we have，though an indirect，yet a strong and perpetual declaration， that the human nature did not originally belong to him，and was not properly his own．＂Joh．v． 27．iii．13．vi． 62.
 to denote being houseless and destitute．See Wetstein＇s examples．

21．Ërtpos］for $\mathbb{d} \lambda \lambda$ ， ，i．e．either one of the twelve，or of the disciples in general；said by tradition to be Philip．His father was，if not dead，at the point of death．＇Exípeqóv к．т．$\lambda$ ． A request（implying that he had been called by our Lord）in itself reasonable．Thus Elijah per－ milted Elisha to go and bid adieu to his parents．

And it was regarded as the solemn duty of child－ res to take care of the funerals of their parents．
 Equivalent to，＂become my disciple．＂
22．ädes－vexpoús］A sentential paradox per antanaclasin（possibly proverbial）turning on the double meaning of verpois，which may mean not only naturally dead，but spiritually dead， i．e．insensible to the concerns of the soul or eternity，dead in trespasses and sins．A metaphor familiar to the Jews，and not unknown to the Greeks，as appears from the examples and illus－ rations adduced by the Commentators．Tours éavt $\bar{\omega} \nu \nu$ venous is well explained by Euthym． тoùs тробๆко́vтas aùтois עeкроús．So Thucyd．



24．$\sigma$ ell $\sigma \mu \dot{\rho}$ ］The word properly denotes ere notus ；but sometimes，as here，stands for maris commotion，$\lambda a i \lambda a \psi$ ，（a hurricane）which is the term used by Mark and Luke．＇ExáӨcuòe，＇and he was asleep．＇＇A $\boldsymbol{\pi} 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{\mu} \mu e \theta a$, we are perishing， are lost．
26．ठ入ıуо́тเбто九］viz．in not confiding in his power to save，as well asleep as awake．
 $\mu \eta \sigma e \tau_{\bar{\eta}} \dot{e} \rho \cup \theta_{\rho \bar{\alpha}} \theta_{\dot{a} \lambda \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta}$ ．and lxvii． 31 ． xviii．16．civ．7．Neh．i．4． 2 Macc．ix． 8.
 $\boldsymbol{\delta \pi} เ \tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \epsilon t \nu^{-}$These nouns $\dot{\alpha} \nu \sigma \mu o s$ and $\theta a \lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma a$ have the Art．，as denoting some of the great objects of nature．See Middlet．Gr．A．in．1， 5. The suddenness of the perfect calm is a proof of the reality of the miracle；for after a storm，the sea is never perfectly smooth until some time has elapsed．
27．тотaxós］This word is used both to denote qualis and quantus．The men（probably the sailors and some others who went as passengers） might well regard our Lord as super－human， since to still the raging of the sea，is in Scripture （See Pr．lxiv．7．avi． 25 and 29. ）reckoned among the attributes of God．
m Marc． $\mathbf{B}_{\text {．}}$ manc． 6 Luc．8． 26















n Marc．2． 1. Luc．S．16．


28．「epyeonviv．］．The reading here is very uncertain，fluctuating between $\Gamma \in \rho \gamma \in \sigma \eta \nu \varpi \nu$ ， $\Gamma \epsilon \rho a \sigma \eta \nu \bar{\omega} \nu$ ，and Гaঠapŋעш̄ע．The evidence， however，for the two latter readings is weak compared with that for the former．Though that would deserve little attention，if it were certain，as Wets．，and Fritz．have shown it to be possible，that the reading arose from the con－ jecture of Origen．They have said enough to prove that 「adapnvciv，which is found in Mark and Luke，is very likely to be the true reading． Yet $\Gamma \in \rho \gamma \in \sigma \eta \nu \bar{\omega} \nu$（as the name of the country） may be defended on critical grounds；and as the thing is so very uncertain，it seems best to follow the authority of MSS．
－$\mu \nu \eta \mu \varepsilon i \omega \omega]$ Tombs were not only among the Jews，but Gentiles，very spacious，and usually subterranean．Hence they often served as places of shelter to the houseless wanderer，or such poor wretches as demoniacs，driven from human habitations；places indeed which might seem not unsuitable to them，since the antients sup－ posed that evil demons hovered about sepulchres． Xadenoi．The word properly denotes（like aंтopos and some other words）＂＇what brings one into difficulty and peril；＂and is applied both to things inanimate and animate，as brutes，or brutal persons，and signifies savage，fierce．Of all these uses examples may be seen in Wets． ＇I $\sigma$ úesv，for dúvar甘at，as in the Sept．

29．тi $\dot{j} \mu i \nu$ кal $\sigma o i$ ］An idiom frequent both in Hellenistic and Classical Greek，of which see examples in Wets．and Matth．Gr．Gr．§ 385.10. There is an ellipsis either of кoivò，expressed by Ach．Tat．and Leon．Tar．ap．Wets．，or $\pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \gamma \mu a$ ， supplied in pasaages of Demosth．and Nicho－ machus cited in Recens．Syn．The sense of the phrase somewhat varies with the context，but it usually implies troublesome or unauthorised in－ terference．Here it seems to be：＇what authority
hast thou over us：＇what have we to do with thee（as subjects）？＇Inooū before vì̀ roū $\theta$ coû is omitted in some MSS．，and cancelled by Griesb．；but rashly；for，as Matth．suggests， ＂sigla＇Invoù ante ít＇̇ facile negligebatur．＇，
 the day of judgement，against which evil spirits are reserved to be chained in torments in the pit of destruction．See II Pet．ii．4．Jude 6.

30．$\mu \alpha \kappa \rho \alpha \nu$ ］＂a good way off＂．E．T．Better ＇at some distance＇，as Newcome and Campb． render．Makpos，like all such words，is of comparative force．If the above mode of ex－ planation be objected to，we may here and at Lu．xviii．13．$\mu a \kappa \rho o ́ \theta \epsilon \nu$ ，and some other passages， （including examples of the Latin procul，adduced by Wets．，Munthe，\＆c．）suppose the word to mean off，opposite to，implying a short distance．

31．ẽitpeqov i $\mu i \nu]$ Griesb．edits，from four MSS．and some inferior Versions，daboreilov $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s$ ．His reasons（adopted by A．Clark and others）are，indeed，specious，but not to be balanced against the strong external evidence for the common reading．

32．катаं то This sense of кaт $\alpha$ is frequent in the best Classical writers，examples from whom are ad－ duced by Wets．，Munthe，\＆c．Kuin．and others wrongly compare $\dot{v} \boldsymbol{x} \delta$ and the Heb． 2.
 xiv． 17.
IX．1．$\tau \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ oiov］i．e．either the vessel which had brought them over，or the feary boat． ＇Ióíav ródıl．So els tìv tódıv aúvoû in 1 Sam．viii．22．This expression denoted not only the place of any one＇s birth，but residence； and，according to the Jewish laws，a year＇s residence gave citizenship．
 appears from the trouble which（as we find by
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Mark ii. 4. and Lu. v. 19.) they had taken to bring the man. 'Aфécoutat. As dфécosa is used
 dфeivral. Preter. Indic., Doricè. See Matth. Gr. Gr. § 206. and Buttm. Gr. p. 424. The sense is, 'thy sins are hereby forgiven thee.' It was usual with the Jews, in accordance with the language of the Old Testament, to regard diseases as the effects of sin.
3. cixioy हो éautoîs] A popular form of expreasion like one in our own language, answering to deadoyıYónevot è tais кapoíats of Mark and Luke. Bhaбфп $\mu$ ei. Though in the Classical writers the word almost always denotes, in its proper sense, to calumniate; yet in Scripture it almost invariably, as here, has the religious sense to spoak impiously of God. The Commentators, bowever, adduce one or two examples of this latter sense, from Philo and Menander.
4. Lowiv] for eliows, as in Lu. vi. 8. and xi. 17. The distinction is neglected by some of the later writers, especially Philo and Josephus. 'Ivati. " The origin of the expression (says Fritz.) is to be explained by ellipsis. The complete phrase after the present tense is iva $\tau i$ yévy $\tau a t$, 'ut quid fiat.'" after the Preterite, "Lua $\tau i$ yévoivo, 'ut quid fieret?' See Herm. on Vig. p. 849.
5. $\tau \ell$ ] for wórepoy. There is in this passage an irregularity of construction, which has perplexed the Commentators, most of whom are of opinion that the words тóтe $\lambda$ éret $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ тapaloruce are parenthetical; and they suppose a transition in the address, $\Sigma \nu a$ ei $\delta \eta \tau \epsilon$, , \&c. being directed to the lawyers, and $\bar{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ep $\theta e i s$, \&c. to the pardytic. But this parenthesis involves somewhat of harshness; and we should thus expect
 Oels, \&ce. Other modes of taking the words are resorted to by Heins., Kuin., and Fritz., all liable to abjection. It should seem best not to
suppose a parenthesis, but to consider the words خעа elò $\bar{\eta} \tau \epsilon-\alpha \mu a \rho \tau i a s$ as said per anantapodoton, or aposiopesin. This I have ventured to indicate in the usual way. Thus the sense of the whole passage may be expressed in paraphrase as follows. 'It was as easy for me to pronounce Thy sins are forgiven thee, as to say with effect,' " Rise and walk. But that ye may know that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (I have done what I have done.) Then addressing the paralytic, he said, Arise, \&c."
8. of $x \lambda 01$ ] The use of the plural, in this and a few other nouns of multitude, is confined to the later writers. Tois $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \dot{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi}$ os. This is usually considered as Plur. for Sing.; but, as was seen by Grot. and Fritz., the Plural has place in sententia generati. 'A $\nu$ คpwixoss stands for, 'the human race.'
9. $\pi a \rho \alpha \dot{\gamma} \omega \nu$ ] The word properly signifies to pass by, or away ; and here, to go away, withdraw, like the Heb. עבר. The sense is, 'as Jesus was passing onward or away thence.' Td $\tau \in \lambda \omega^{\prime} \nu \iota o \nu$, the toll-house; a sort of hut in which the collector sat. The word is sometimes written $\tau \in \lambda \omega \nu \in i o v$, and seems to be properly an adjec-
 $a \dot{u} \tau \bar{\varphi}$. He had no hesitation in doing this, as being, doubtless, well acquainted with the character of Jesus. It is generally agreed, from the great similarity of the narrations, that the Matthew here and the Levi of Mark ii. 14. and Lu. v. 29. are names of the same individual, especially as it was usual with the Jews to bear two names.
10. ह้̇ $\tau \bar{\eta}$ olkia] 'irf his house,' i. e. of Matthew ; for our Lord had none. The кal before lòo seems harsh; but may be best considered, with Fritz., as used, like the Heb. I in 1 Sam. xxviii. 1. and 2 Sam. xiii. 1., in the sense nempe. 'A $\mu a \rho \tau \omega \lambda o l$. The word here,
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and usually elsewhere, denotes heathens, or such Jews as associated with them, and were put on a footing with them. See Recens. Synop.
11. סıati-és日ici] From the passages cited by Wets. and others, it appears that the Heathens in like manner accounted it a pollution to eat with the impious.
12. ov xpeiav- Xovres.] This appears from the Classical citations adduced by Wets. Fritz. \&c. to have been a proverbial expression employed to rebut such like reproaches as the present.
13. The connection here is thus traced by Kuin. "You Pharisees severely censure me for associating with persons whom you call iniquitous, such as the tax-gatherers. I therefore remind you of the word of God, as found in the Prophet, \&c." Mopeuөévés. This is not, as the Commentators usually say, redundant ; but is put for the verb with kal; q. d. 'Go and apply yourselves to learn.' So the phrase cited by Schoettg. ול וצ go and learn, as used by Rabbis when they wished to refer their disciples to the Scriptures. The indefinite mode of citation here employed was, as Surenhus says, usual with the Rabbis, and, in some measure, with all the antient writers. See Valckn. on Herodo. iv. 131.

- $\left.\lambda_{\text {col }}\right]$ The word here denotes $\phi \iota \lambda a \nu 0$ рwsía, universal benevolence. The of the Hebr. and the oi cal here denote, not a simple and absolute, but comparative negation, and may be rendered non tam-quam; an idiom common to both Hebrew and Greek. Passages similar in sentiment are adduced from the Rabbinical writers by Wets. and Scheid, and from the Classical writers by Kypke, Munthe, \&c. Ouaia is taken, by synecdoche, for the whole of the ceremonial law.
- ó $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{a} \rho \dot{j} \boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda \theta_{o \nu} \& c$.] These words are rightly explained by the antients and mosi moderns: - Not you who, like the Pharisees, fancy yourselves righteous, but you who acknowledge yourselves sinners, and seek a methoa of expiation.' The words cis $\mu \in \tau \dot{\text { a }}$, moctv, which are not found in several MSS. and Versions and Latin Fathers, are disapproved by Mill, Bengel,

Knappe, and Vater, and cancelled by Grot. They are, however, defended by Whitiy, Wets., Matthæi, and Fritz.; and as the MS. authority for them is so strong, they must certainly be retained. Indeed, as Fritz. observes, they seem quite necessary to the course of argument, and yet cannot well be thought left to be understood.
14. עทनтєío $\epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ] We are not to understand public, but private fasts, upon various extraordinary occasions.
 form of expressing by coxjecture, what is meant to be strongly denied. The súvactat is not redundant. (as Kuin. and others say) but, by the ellipse of some words (such as here, "consistently with the nature of a marriage feast," which Fritz. supplies) it imports debere, licere, decere. See Schleus. Lex. or Wahl's
 Hebraism whereby בן prefixed denotes distinction or participation) those who were admitted into the bride chamber, i. e. the friends of the bridegroom, the тара́y $\mu \mu$ оь pronubi, who formed the marriage procession, and were invited to a participation of the seven days matrimonial feasting. Пe $\nu \in \epsilon i ̄ \nu$. Mark and Luke have עทoтeúciv. Yet тє $\begin{aligned} \\ \theta i \bar{\nu} \\ \text { may be taken per synecdochen; for }\end{aligned}$ fasting was among the signs of grief. In ó $\nu \cup \mu \phi$ ios there is a reference to the title given by the antient Hebrews to Christ. N may fast.
16. oúdeis $\epsilon \pi \iota \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda_{\text {ei }} \& c$.] ' no one clappeth a patch of undressed cloth' \&c., i. e. rough from the weaver, and which has not yet passed through the hands of the fuller, and is therefore, as we say, brand-new. Thus the expression answers to the кasydv of Luke. ' $E \pi i \beta \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ is Hellenistic
 that the two substances being dissimilar, (one rigid and the other supple) will never wear well together, but the rigid will tear away part of the supple. The comparison is popular and striking; and the application meant by this and the metaphor in the next verse, is the inexpediency of imposing too gricyous burthens on them during their weakness and imperfection, as new converts.
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#### Abstract

 used to signify infundere, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. 'Aqkous, i. e. flasks made of goat or sheep skins, used in all the antient nations, and still employed in the Southern parts of Europe. 'A $\boldsymbol{\prime} \phi$ óтероя. On this reading all the Editors are agreed, from Mill to Fritz. It is found in almost all the MSS., the Edit. Princ., and some other early Edd.: as also in the parallel passage of Luke. As to the common reading слфотєрк, it is one of the many unauthorized alterations made by Erasmus, and received en zaasse by Steph. in his third Edition. It may; indeed, be defended in the sense ' both things;' but it probably arose from accident; $o t$ and $a$ being perpetually confounded.


18. $\alpha \rho \chi \infty \nu]$ Scil. Tiss quvararis, which is erpressed in Lu. viii. 41. He is by Mark v. 22. called aipxıovváyooyos, and named Jairus. After $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi^{\infty}$ the Fdit. Princ., and the best of the Versions; and is adopted by Wets., Griesb., Matth., and Fritz., on sufficient critical grounds. "A $\rho \tau \iota$
 as it were dead.' Very agreeable to Mark's
 certain it is that $\dot{\alpha} \pi 0 \theta \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \kappa \infty \infty$, like the Heb. מות, was used of those at the point of death. Chrys. thinks that he spoke according to his conjecture, or might exaggerate the calamity. 'ExiOes $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ xeipa, i. e. says Grot. According to the custom of our Lord, as it had been also of the prophets, who, in praying for the benefit of any person, used to put their hands upon him. See Num. xxvii. 18. 2. Kings v. 11. Matth. xix. 13. Acts iv. 30. Znंбeras. The interpretation of this word must depend upon the sense assigned to the former $\dot{\text { èredeúrnae: }}$ but in the popular acceptation it is susceptible of either the signifeation to be restored to life, or to continue to live, which must imply recovery from her sicknees.
19. aimopंooūa] On the nature of this dis-
order see Bartholin and Mead, cited by Kuin., or Recens. Synop. Whichever opinion be adopted, one thing is certain, that a flux of blood of either kind is the least curable of all distempers. Tou крaбォéouv. Not so much the hem, as the tassel, i. e. one of the lower tassels of the garment, which had four corners called $\pi \tau \epsilon \rho u ́ y i a$, from each of which was suspended a tassel of threads or strings, called a $\kappa \rho \alpha \sigma \pi \in \dot{o} o \nu$, which word is explained by Hesych. кєклшблévò $\dot{\rho} \dot{\alpha} \mu \mu a$. To touch the two lower ones, was regarded as a mark of profound respect. This, however, is not to be regarded as exclusively a Jeuish custom; for I have, in Recens. Synop., adduced three examples (from Arrian, Athenæus, and Plutarch) of heathens touching or kissing the fringe of the garment of a great man, as a mark of respect, and to gain his good will and favour. The secrecy and delicacy here employed may be attributed to the nuture of the disorder, which was considered unclean.
20. $\sigma \omega \theta$ rijouat.] 'I shall be restored to health.' The word is not unfrequent in this sense, as used of recovery from a dangerous disorder. See Note on Matth. i. 22.
21. Toùs $\alpha \dot{v} \lambda \eta \tau \dot{\varepsilon}$.] The antiquity of the custom of wailing for the dead, and expressing grief by tearing the hair and mangling the flesh, appears from various parts of the Old Testament. Besides these offices of relations, other persons were hired to cooperate in the howling, and to sing dirges accompanied by various wind instruments. The custom was also common to the Greeks and Romans, and even to the Northern barbarians, and is yet found among the lrish and many barbarous nations. Өopvßoúrevov. This would properly mean tumultuantem; but the word mast here include the sense of lamentation, namely such tumultuary responses as the prefice would make in concert.
 infer from this that the girl was not dead. For that is contrary to the whole tenor of the narra-
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tion. The best Commentators are agreed that the sense is, 'she is not $s 0$ departed as not to return to life,' (which was the idea associated with death;) and that by cäcúdec is meant, 'is as it were asleep.'
22. ${ }^{6} \xi \in \beta \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \theta_{\eta} \eta$ ] 'was dismissed,' or, required to withdraw. This and many such terms in both Hellenistic and Classical writers are not to be strained, but to be taken populariter. Our Lord acted thus, in order that those whom he wished to be spectators of the miracles (as the parents and Peter, James, and John, see Mark y. 37-40.) might view what was done without interruption. 'Eкрáтnae rîs Xđcoós. Not as a form of raising any one, nor through courtesy, or more medicorum, as many Commentators say; but, as usual, to accompany the miracle with some act, as that of touching; and touching by the hard was emblematical of recovery. ' $\mathrm{H} \gamma^{\prime} \rho \theta_{\eta} \eta$, i. e. was raised from death, as it were from 2 sleep.
23. if $\phi \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu \eta \alpha j^{\prime} \tau \eta$ ] 'this report,' i. e. the report of this.
24. vić $\Delta a \beta i o ̀$ ] As that was one of the titles then ascribed by the Jews to the Messiah, this was an unequivocal acknowledgement of Jesus's Messiahship, which must have been founded on their reliance on the testimony of others who.had seen his miracles.
25. Tijv olkíav] i. e. the house in which he sojourned at Capernaum.
 they were restored to sight, or, they received the faculty of sight. This is thought to be a Hebraism; but probably it is a popular form of expression. Thus it is found also in the Classical writers. See Recens. Synop. 'Eveßp! $\mu$ ท'бato, 'strictly enjoined them.' The expression, notwithstanding its etymology, only imported earnestness and strictness, not passion.
 except of things; when used of persons, it signifies to make any one known or celebrated.
26. кшоф $\nu \nu$, $\delta a \iota \mu о \nu \iota \zeta$ ó $\mu \in \nu o \nu$.] So I point, with Vater and Fritz. For, as Fritz. observes, the latter word is explanatory of the former; $q$. d. 'who was such, by demoniacal influence.' And this Rosenm. and Kuin. admit is the sense intended by St. Matthew and St. Luke. Yet, with a strange perversity, they chuse to ascribe the dumbness to disorder. Only, they say, "the Evangelist thought proper to retain the common expression." But this is very inconsistent, unless they admit that St. Matthew and St. Luke countenanced what theyknew to be mere superstition, in order to exaggerate the glory of their Lord; which is neither reconcileable with their general conduct, nor with that firm belief of demoniacal influence which appears every where in their writings. And yet, be it remembered that Luke, as a physician, could well distinguish a demoniacal possession from a malady. Besides, the truth and dignity of the miracle will not remain the same. It would not be the same miracle; and the dignity would be far less. Therefore, notwithstanding what is urged by Mead, in his Med. Sacr. Praf. p. 7., we may be assured that, in proportion as the mind exceeds in dignity the body, and the soul the life, 80 must the suppression of evil from supernatural agents, exceed that of evil produced in the regular course of nature. And finally, the exclamation of the people (which the Evangelist cites with manifest approbation) necessarily supposes the cure of demoniacal possession, not that of disease; for the latter had been very frequently seen in Israel, and evinced by the Prophets; nay, even 80 far as to raise the dead.
27. vúdénoтe ¿фब́vך olitwe.] An elliptical form of expression, in which тоüro or тоойтó Tt and yevó Fritz., indeed, objects to the uncommonness of the ellipsis; but without reason, for this seems to have been an idiomatical or popular form of expression. Mill, Wets., Griesb., and Matth. are agreed that öt before oúdéxote must the
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cancelled. It is found in very few MSS., has no place in the Edit. Prince. and the early Versions, and was introduced by Erasmus, on slight authority, and received, with all other alterations, into the third Edition of Stephens.
28. to row $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \rho x$.] per, Heb. ב. This however, is pot a Hebraism. To the examples adduced by Schleus. Lex. may be added another from Thucyd.

29. év $\tau \hat{0} \lambda a \bar{\omega}$.$] These words are not found$ in several XSS. and the Edit. Princess, almost all the antient Versions, and some Greek Fathers. As such they are rejected by Mill, cancelled by Griesb. and Fritz., and bracketed by Knapp. and Voter; though retained by Mathæi. They were probably derived from Iv. 23.
30. $\left.\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \pi \lambda a \gamma \chi{ }^{v i} i \theta_{\eta}\right]$ ' was moved with compossion.' The word occurs neither in the Sept. nor the Classical writers, and seems to have been formed by the New Testament writers from orinárxya, bowels; for there the Jews placed the seat of sympathy, by a metaphor taken from that yearning which is felt in pity, or the other kindly affections. The verb is construed sometines with refl, with or without a Genit., and with $\dot{\text { del }} \boldsymbol{l}$ and an Ascus. ' Eбкvi $\mu$ évoc. It is almost impossible to imagine stronger authority, internal and external, than exists for this reading, which has been approved by almost every Commentator, and received by all the Editors from Wets. downwards; as to the common read-
 of érxv $\mu$ évot is, harassed, vexed, troubled. This verb does not denote (as is commonly said) to test the hair, but to claw, as applied to dogs and other animals: so Aischyl. Pes. 583. үvazéj $\mu \in \nu a$ oxvilóvtat. where see Dr. Blomfield. The word also oceurs at Mark v. 35. and Lu. vii. 44.
 cered, as some render, but tossed aside, abandoned, unprotected. See the examples adduced by Wets. Similar pastoral images occur in 1 Kings xxii. 17. and Judith xi. 19.
 comparison, like many others in Scripture. "Epos and its compounds are peculiarly applied to the labours of husbandry. This seems to have been a proverbial saying. At least we find by Schoettg. that in the Rabbinical writings teachers were figured as reapers, and their work of instructon, the harvest.
31. $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta$ ] Simply for $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \eta$, like the Heb.
 mentators here subaud kava, which, from its being found in the text of several MSS., appears to be an antient gloss. The $\pi \nu \in u \mu$. is rightly regadded by Kuin. as a Genit. of object; as in Ecclus. x. 4. éGovaia $\tau \bar{\eta} \bar{s} \gamma \bar{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$. John. xvii. 2. Rom. ix. 21. and several passages of the Classical writers cited by Raphel and Palairet.
32. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau o \lambda \omega \nu]$ This important word properl denotes $\dot{o} \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau a \lambda \mu \epsilon ́ v o s$, one sent by another, for any purpose whatever, as in Herod. i. 21. where it signifies a herald. But (in initation of the Heb. mEm) it is, in the New Testament, almost always used to denote' a person employed to convey the message of salvation from God to man,' and especially one of the twelve Apostles, who were peculiarly so called, as being
 commissioned to preach the Gospel in Judea, and who afterwards received full authority not only to promulgate his religion throughout the world, but to found and regulate the Christian Church, especially to ordain teachers and pastors, who should hereafter themselves govern it by ordiary authority. The appellation is supposed to be derived from the name of a confidential counsellor sent by the High Priest on missions to the foreign Jews, to collect the tribute for the repairs of the Temple, \&c.

- $\pi \rho$ w̄тos-Пе́тpos] i. e. first in order, as being first called, not in dignity; for Christ seems not to have authorized any difference. If he had done so, the Evangelists would have observed it;
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but they have not; for the names are recited by them in different order. Judas, however, is always named last, and Peter first, and John and his brother James third and fourth, or fourth and fifth. Certainly these three were especially esteemed by Christ, perhaps for their docility, attachment, and mental endowments. (Rosenm.) That the Apostles were all placed on an equal footing, in point of rank, is certain, from the different order in which they are placed by the several Evangelists.
4. $\dot{o}$ 'Iбкари́тク!s] The $\dot{o}$ does not occur in the text of Stephens, nor in that of the preceding Editions; but was brought in by the Elzevir Editor, and retained by Wets. and all the recent Editors except Matthæi. The presence or the absence of the Art. depends, as Middlet. observes, upon whether 'I $\sigma \kappa a \rho \iota o$ órns be a surname, or an epithet significant of place of birth or residence. If, as Chrys. and some others say, it is derived from Cariot, Judas's birth place, the Art. is required ; and if it be a mere surname, it should not have it, as Middlet. observes. Yet as, on other occasions, the Art. is often omitted where in propriety it ought to have place, because it is implied, (as when a cognomen passes into a simple name) so it may be here; and therefore we cannot possibly determine as to the reading; though there is nothing that negatives the opinion of the antients that it is a name of place. 'O rapaious a. Not, 'who betrayed,' (that would require тןodoús) but, 'delivered him up.' Vulg. tradidit. On the use of which term, as marking the fact, without adding any thing of praise or blame, Campb. justly points out the candour and impartiality of St. Matthew, as of all the Evangelists.
 The Genit. here is a Genit. of motion, as in Gen. iii. 24. "the way of the tree of life," for, the way which leadeth unto the tree of life. And Jer. ii. 18. ท̀ ódds Alyútrov. (Kuin. and Fritz.) Els ró $\lambda \iota \nu$, Sub. rıvà; for it is wrongly taken by Kuin. of 'the city of Samaria;' which would require the Art.
8. vekpoùs eqeipere] Editors and Critics are divided in opinion as to the authenticity of these
words, which are rejected by the generality of Critics, but strenuously defended by Griesb. and Fritz. The arguments on both sides (summed up in Recens. Synop.) seem to be of nearly equal force, and therefore as far as regards internal evidence, an Editor would not be justified in omitting them, as is done by Matthæi. But as the external evidence is so much against them, (they not being found in the best and the greater part of the MSS. the Fdit. Princ., and some Versions and Fathers) that they are of doubtful authority, they should therefore be bracketed. I have not followed the change of position adopted by Knapp., from some MSS. and Versions, because that would remove one principal cause which may be assigned for their omission; for after
 the two clauses being so nearly alike. The change of position might very well arise from omission, supplied in the margin; and certainly more reasons may be conceived for the omission, than the insertion, of the words.
 Gr. Gr. $\$ 423$. This (which is a sort of proverbial saying, must, as appears from Lu. x. 7.) be confined to what went just before, namely, the dispensing of miraculous gifts; and therefore cannot be drawn into an argument against the maintenance of Christ's ministers. The sense is: 'Freely ye have, received the power, and gratuitously bestow it.'
9. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ Kтívnoөє] 'ye must not provide, or furnish, yourselves with.' A signification of the word common in the best Classical writers,
 words ( to which $\mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \kappa \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \sigma \theta \in \chi \rho v \sigma d \nu, \mu \eta \delta \varepsilon \dot{\alpha} \rho \gamma$. $\mu \eta \delta \dot{d} \chi^{\alpha} \lambda \kappa \delta \nu$, must be all referred) signify, 'for your purses,' i. e. for your travelling expenses. そwivas signifies properly girdles. But the Oriental nations, (the Greeks and Romans) used the belt with which their flowing garments were confined, as purses. And this is still customary in the East and in Greece.
10. Tท'pa $\nu$ ] A sort of wallet, generally of leather, used by Shepherds and travellers for the reception of provisions, mentioned both in the Old Testament and in Homer. Yet as els ódou,
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- for the use of the journey,' is here associated with it, it may mean, by a common figure, the provisions themselves. $\Delta \dot{0} 0$ रıтй̀as. This, (as Fritz. rightly remarks) does not forbid the wearing of two coats, (for the antients generally wore two on a journey) but a change of coats. ' Y roobipara. A sort of strong shoes, for long journics. On other occasions sandals were worn. These idoos $\dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \alpha$ they were not to provide, but (as Mark more clearly expresses it) to use
 in most of the MSS., many of them antient, the Edit. Princ., the two first of Steph. in Theophyl., and Eng. Vers.; and is preferred by Grot., Beza, and Wets. It, however, yields a very frigid sense, and is totally at variance with the
 less we interpret $\dot{\rho} \alpha \beta \delta o u s, a$ change of staves; which would be harsh. It therefore seems better, with Mill, Griesb., Matth. and all other recent Fditors, to retain $\dot{\rho} \alpha^{\prime} \beta \delta o \nu$, and take it to mean, that they should not procide themselves with a staff; not forbidding them to use the one they might have. T $\rho \circ \phi \bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}$, i. e. maintenance generally. The words akios-rpoфins have the air of an adage.
 company. Some other ellipses which have been supposed, are too arbitrary. Nay the absolute use, which is found both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, and supported by the antient interpreters, may possibly be preferable.

12. air $\left.\eta^{\prime} \nu\right]$ scil. olxiav, the family.
 are commonly regarded as examples of Imperat. for Future. But it is better, with Fritz. to take the sense 'voles pacem vestram.' E!priv $\quad$ i. e. the benefit of your peace, \&c. or blessing. IIpds
 sense, to signify, 'become void and ineffectual.'

 ceos $\alpha \ddot{\nu}$ тe入co $\theta \tilde{\eta}$ ö $\sigma \alpha$ ầ $\dot{j} \theta e \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha$. See also Ps. xxxiv. 6. and vii. 16.
13. Kal ós éàv] This is not (as is commonly said) for ${ }^{\epsilon \alpha \nu} \delta$ dè $\tau t s$; but deà is for $\hat{a} \nu$. The construction is popular, and involves an antapodoton of frequent occurrence; and écei $\nu \eta$ s is for $\dot{\epsilon} x i^{\prime} \nu o u$, per synesin. The Genit. mod $\bar{\omega} \nu$ is governed by the $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ in $\dot{\text { éctı }}$ dust from the feet at any time was a symbolical action disclaiming all intercourse with them.
 ment.' Some Commentators understand this of the destruction of the Jewish nation. But that is rather, as Whitby observes, styled the day of vengeance ; and is otherwise, as the same Commentator has proved, inapplicable here. The expression, then, must, notwithstanding the omission of the Article, (on which see Middtet.) be understood of the day of final judgment.
14. रiveode-reptorepai] Two beautiful and appropriate similes (common in the Classical writers) which hint at the dangers to which they would be exposed, and the best means of avoiding them. Similar sentiments are adduced from the Rabbinical writers.
 sons just designated under the character of wolves, the persecuting and bigotted Jews. See Middlet.
15. els maptípiov aùrois] namely, of the truth of the Gospel, by your endurance of persecution in behalf of it.
16. $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \mu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \tau \epsilon]$ i. e. be not anxiously so-
 $x \omega \bar{s}$ refers to the manner, $\tau i$ to the matter of what should be spoken. $\Delta o \theta_{\text {rírerat, ' it shall be. }}$ suggested to you.'














20．od $\gamma \dot{a} \rho]$ The Commentators are agreed that this is a comparative negation，as non tam quam，of which there are many examples in the Scriptural and Classical writers．But Winer in his Gr．N．T．p．139．seems right in denying this qualified sense to have place in ou followed by $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ ；and discubsing several passages where the formula is found，（as Acts v．4．and 1 Thess． iv．8． 1 Cor．i．17．and the present passage） shows that the sentiment is enfeebled when the ou is translated non tam．Here，he observes，the re－ ference is not to the physical act of speaking，but to the sentiment uttered，which was to be really imparted to the Apostles by the Holy Spint． Newcome very woll supplies＂in effect and ul－ timately．＂＇Eनтe．Pres．for Fut．Or it may stand for are to be，populariter．The sense is： ＇for you are not to be the speakers，but the spirit of your Father（is to be）that which speak－ eth（or，the speaker）in you．＇

21．dжаעаनтíбovтal Kuin．，Rosenm．and others，take this as a forensic term，to signify rising up as witnesses．And they appeal to Matth．xii．41．But there $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \bar{j} \kappa \rho i \sigma \epsilon t$ is added． There seems no reason to abandon the usual interpretation，as referred to hostility，attack， and persecution，which is well supported by Wets．，Kypke，and Fritz．Here may be com－ pared a very similar passage of Thucyd．iii． 83．Kal үà татìp таī̀a dлє́ктєเvє，＂used to put to death．＇
22．$\pi \alpha^{\alpha} \nu \tau \infty \nu$ ］Commonly taken for many ；but better by Euthym．，for most，quasi omnibus．Ets rélos．This does not denote the destruction of
 rary preservation，as Hamm．，Wets．，and Rosenm． explain ；but té $\bar{c} o s$ is by the antient and most modern Commentators rightly interpreted，the end of their troubles，whether by death or de－ liverance；and $\sigma \omega 0$ ท＇бeral denotes salvation in heaven．

23．Tin—Tiv］Middlet．observes that the Art． is not without meaning，serving to mark the op－ position between out os and aid only being supposed．＂Taлéनŋte tàs wólets， for re入．（ тìv dody dcai）тàs тónces．The ellipsis is frequent in the Classical writers，as Thucyd． iv．78．ds $\phi \dot{\alpha} \rho \sigma a \lambda o \nu$ dंтė $\epsilon \sigma \sigma$ ，where see my note． ＂E $\cos$－d $\nu \theta \rho \omega^{\prime} \pi o v$, until，or unto，up to the
time when，\＆c．The words are by the best Commentators referred to the destruction of Jerusalem．
 or，＇no disciple is above his master．＇See Mid－ dlet．A proverbial saying，of which several ex－ amples are adduced by Wets．It imports that he cannot expect better treatment than his master．
25．Bee $\zeta_{\epsilon} \beta_{\beta o b \lambda]}$ Several Editors and Critics would read $\mathrm{B}_{\in \in \lambda} \zeta_{\epsilon} \beta \circ \dot{0} \beta$ ，which Jerome adopted into the Vulg．，under the idea that it is the same with the Ekronite idol called at 2 Kings i． 2. ，בעל ובוב，the Lord of flies；and that the change was made of $\beta$ into $\lambda$ ，agreeably to the genius of the Greek language，which admits no word to end in $\beta$ ．But（as Grot．，Lightf．，Wets．，and others remark）the title was one of honour，like the Zєis＇Aжо́иvïos，banisher of flies，given to Hercules．Whereas the name here evidently is one of contempt．Hence the best Commentators with reason suppose that the name is indeed the same with that of the above－mentioned；but， according to a custom among the Jews，of alter－ ing the numes of idols，to throw contempt on them，changed to Bec $\boldsymbol{K}_{\epsilon} \beta$ ovi $\lambda$, i．e．Lord of dung， or metaphorically，idolatry．Hence it was after－ wards given by the Jews to the prince of dæmons． For Bee入 $\zeta_{\epsilon} \beta$ oi $\beta$ there is scarcely the authority of one Greek MS．＇Eкádєбау．Wets．，Griesb．， Kuin．，Vater，and Fritz．edit．è $\pi \epsilon \kappa \alpha \lambda e \sigma a \nu$ ，which indeed has strong authority from MSS．，Editions， and Fathers．Yet as the MSS．fluctuate between this and three other readings，we may suspect alteration；and then the simplest reading is to be preferred．Thus，in the present case，exá入 $\operatorname{co\sigma av}$ might give birth to all the rest．I have therefore left the common reading，which is confirmed by the Moscow MSS．，and retained by Matth．
26．$\mu \dot{\eta}$ оù $\nu \phi \circ \beta \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon \kappa$ ．т．$\lambda$ ．］The sense here is disputed；but it seems to be：＇Fear not your persecutors and calumniators，nor be alarmed for the success of the Gospel；for your innocence shall be made as clear as the light，and your doc－ trine shall enlighten the whole world．＇The words following contain a proverb usual among the Heathens，importing that the truth cannot be extinguished；as in the well－known＇Magna eat veritas et pravalebit．＇
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 the Classical examples in Wets. and Recens. Syrop. ; as also of dojua in the sense house-top. They are all metaphorical, and the last adagial.
28. фоß ${ }^{2} \theta \bar{\eta}$ T $\epsilon$ ] Wets., Griesb., Math., Kuin., and Fat. edit $\phi_{o \beta e i} \sigma \theta$ e, from many MSS., the Edit. Princ., and some Fathers. The evidence is mo equally balanced that it is difficult to say which is the true reading. It therefore seems prodent (especially as there is no difference in sense) to retain the common reading, which, indeed, is found in the parallel passage at Lu. xii. 4. 'ATd rà droxrecyóntwe. Though there is considerable authority for dxоктevóvtcov, which im preferred by pearly all the great Editors, yet here again there seems no sufficient reason for change, since the common reading is more suitable in sense, is found in at least as many MSS., abd is confirmed by the parallel passage at Luke xii. 4. See also Matth. xxiii. 37. In both these cases, 1 am supported by the authority of Schulz, (the Editor of Griesbach, Nov. Fd.) and Fritz. The construction here with $d \pi d$ is called a He braizm. But it may be paralleled with our feel apprehension of, or from.
 mentators and Winer in his Gr. Gr. \$20.1. But perhaps there is more emphasis in the present position; and the force may be nearly the same $2 s$ in oude $y^{2}$, not even one. In fact, in all the exmanples adduced by Winer, as Eph.v. 5. and iv. 29. 2 Pet. i. 20., there is an intensity of sense.
 the Seriptural, and not unknown in the Classical
 i.e. without the counsel and providence of ; as
 endpyoay. With respect to the sentiment, in-
culcating the superintendence of Providence even over the meanest works of the creation, the Commentators adduce examples of it from the Classical, and especially the Rabbinical writers.
30. кal ai $\tau \rho i \chi \in s$ - $\epsilon i \sigma i$ ] Another proverbial saying (similar to many in the Old 1estament and the Rabbinical writers) importing that the very smallest of our concerns are under the care of God.
 lenistic constraction for $\dot{\delta} \mu o \lambda$. $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\xi}$, as at Lu . xii. 8. Rom. x.9. The sense of the word is literally, 'to make profession in conformity to any one.' In the other member of the sentence it stands for agnoscere, to recognise, approve.
33. d $\rho v \eta \dot{j} \eta \tau a i \mu \mathrm{e}]$ A popular expression for reject profession by my name. In the clause following it signifies to cast off.
 and Campb. remark) a forcible and indeed Oriental mode of expressing the certainty of a foreseen consequence of any measure, by representing it as the purpose for which the measure was adopted. See Whitby. Bd $\lambda \lambda e c \nu$ is here used
 both war, (namely, the Jewish war which soon followed) and dissention; which is supported by what follows and by the parallel passage in Luke xii. 51.
 perly to divide into two parts; but here it denotes to separate and set at variance, in which there is a mixture of two constructions. On the sentiment see Recens. Synop. This and the verse following are formed on Micah vii. 6.
36. тoù duөpósov] Middlet. considers this

 Gen. xlviii. 2. Judg. ii. 19.

${ }_{20}{ }^{\text {Lac. }}$ 14. oixctaxoi aútoì.



 inf. 9.23. 25.

Marc. 8. 35. Marc. 8. 35.
Luce. 9.24. Luce. 9.24 ooh. 12.25. Jon. 12.25.
$k$ Intr. 18. ${ }_{5}$ Intr. 18. 5. Luce. 10.16 . Jon. 13. 80.
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 $\kappa \eta \rho \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \epsilon \iota \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ тaîs $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ au $\hat{\omega} \nu$.

 ciple. Compare Lu. xiv. 26.
38. $\lambda a \mu \beta a \nu$ et $\tau \dot{\delta} \nu \sigma \tau a v \rho \delta \nu]$ An allusion to the Roman custom of compelling a malefactor going to crucifixion, to bear his cross. As crucifixion was not a Jewish punishment, this mention of it may seem to have alluded to our Lord's own crucifixion; and consequently to have been, in a certain sense, prophetical. 'Aкодou日eí ónícu moo. Not a Hebraism, but found in the Classical writers. See Wets. This is a construction which at first involved an addition of sense, but at length became a pleonasm. See Whiner's Gr. Gr. p. 174. sq.
 be an acutè dictum, or Oxymoron, including Paronomasia between the two senses of $\psi u \chi_{j}{ }^{j}$, namely, life and soul. There is also a dilogia in the words aंmo八é $\sigma \epsilon t$ and épioncw. Life, too, Kuin. observes) is an Hebrew image of felicity, and in this sense the word ought to be taken in

 sequently he that receiveth not you, receiveth not me." The treatment shown to an ambassador is in fact shown to his sovereign.
 much as he is such.' By $\pi \rho \rho \phi$. seems to be meant a teacher of the Gospel; and by dicaloy, a pious professor of it.
42. $\mu \iota \kappa \rho \bar{\omega} \nu]$ Not, men of mean station; or, very young persons, as some explain : but, as the antient and the best modern Interpreters take the expression, disciples, as opposed to teachers; either because $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \tau \bar{\nu}$ may be understood at $\mu \iota \kappa p \bar{\omega} y$, from the context, or be taken substantively, as answering to (what it seems was in the original Hebrew) (op, and being, (as we find from the Rabbinical writings) the name given to disciples. Moti\}ecv motiptov is for
 (also found after $\theta \in \rho \mu \delta \nu$ ) which, like frigid and gelid in Latin, is not unfrequent in the Classical writers. It is supplied in Mark ix. 41. To give a cup of cold water was proverbial
for giving the smallest thing. $O \dot{O} \mu \dot{\eta}$, by no means.
XI. 1. doa td $\sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ ] 'giving directions,' or injunctions. Avion. It is not clear to whom the pronoun refers. Chrys. and Euthym. understand the disciples; other antients, the Jews; most modern Commentators, the Galileans, according to the Hebrew idiom of using a pronoun, where its antecedent is not expressed, but must be understood from the context. See Winer's Gr. Gr. § 15,3 .
2. $\delta \dot{v o}$ ] Some MSS., Versions and Fathers, have bia, which was preferred by Mill, Bengel, and Schulz, and edited by Fritz. The evidence, however, for that reading is too weak.
3. $\sigma \dot{v}$ ' $\bar{i}-\pi \rho \rho \sigma \delta о к \bar{\omega} \mu \mathrm{ev} ;$ ] 'Art thou he who should come, or must we look for another?' Few questions have been more debated than the object of John's message, which the Evangelist not having mentioned, we are left to conjecture. Some antients and many modern Commentators think he sent to satisfy some doubts, which had occurred during his tedious confinement. And there is something to countenance this, especially if we suppose, with them, that the words "blested are they who are not offended" were meant for John. But the descent of the Holy Ghost at Christ's baptism, the testimony from heaven, his own divine impulses, by which he recognized Jesus, and his reiterated testimonies to the same effect, negative such a supposition; and to suppose that John's confinement should have affected the strength of his resolves, would do injustice to so great a character. In short, the opinion has been shown to be utterly untenable by Chrys., Euthym., Theophyl., and Greg., of the antients, and Hamm. Whitby, Doddr., and others among the moderns, who maintain that John sent for the satisfaction of his disciples, who, stumbling at the meanness of Jesus's birth, and the lowness of his station, had entertained doubts as to his Messiahship, against whom, and not John, the rebuke just mentioned is levelled. For their satisfaction he had sent ; and our Lord, well aware of his intention, took the surest means to fix the wavering




















minds of John＇s disciples，by displaying such supernatural endowments as completely an－ swered to the predicted character of the Messiah， and then sent them to their master for the ap－ plication．It is not impossible，however，that John might likewise intend（which Kain．and se－ veral German Commentators make the sole or chief purpose of the message）to excite Jesus to delay no longer entering on that earthly kingdom which even John might expect．This，however， is matter of mere conjecture，for the words of the answer do not even glance that way，but only clam the power ascribed to the Messiah in Isaiah xxxv． 5 and 6 and 61 ；and though some of the particulars are not found in the Prophet＇s description，yet they had place in the traditions Which had been handed down from Prophets and hoo ry men，of what should distinguish the coming of the Messiah．
5．सTmxol eiayye入i豸ovtoi］A peculiar fa－ tare of Christianity，as distinguished from Juda－ ism and Heathenism，whose priests and philoso－ phers courted the rich，and contemned the poor． $S_{\text {see John vii．} 49 .}$
6．ox ${ }^{\circ}$ disbelieve and fall from faith in my Messiahship：＂ Exáviadoy signifies a stumbling block，and，in the ecclesiastical sense，what obstructs us in our Christian course，and causes us to fall away from the faith．
7．Ti dEn $\theta_{\text {ere }}$ \＆rc．］Our Lord meant by this high character of John，（delicately reserved till after the departure of his disciples）to avert any suspicion of doubt or inconstancy on his part，to which the words preceding，literally interpreted， might lead．


Commentators are not agreed whether the words should be taken in the natural sense，（in which， however，it must be observed，кdं $\lambda$ a $\mu o \nu$ should be rendered reeds，of which collective use several examples are adduced by Wets．）or the metaphorical，as constituting an image of levity and inconstancy．The former is adopted by Grot．，Berra，Camp．，Wets．，Rosenm．，Schleus．， and Fritz．；the latter by the antients generally， and，of the moderns，by Whity，Mackn．，and Kuin．The latter，indeed，may seem more pointed and significant ；but the former is more simple and agreeable to the context．
$-\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau]$ for $\hat{\eta} \tau \iota$ ，which is not unfrequent in the Classical writers．Ma入akois，i．e．fine， and therefore soft，whether of silk，linen，or other materials．Of this sense some examples are ad－ diced by Wets．，and others may be seen in Recent．Synop．
9．терьбботероу трофทंтоу］＇one superior to a prophet，as was Moses．＇The points of supp－ riority are manifest．
10．loò̀，$\left.{ }^{d} \gamma \omega^{\prime} d \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \in \lambda \omega-\sigma o v\right]$ Taken from Malachi iii．1．，where the Hebr．and Sept．agree， but both differ from the Evangelist；and Doctor Owen suspects a corruption in the Heb ．more antient than the Sept．Version．The sense， however，is nearly the same；and the words are only slightly accommodated to the present par－ pose．
 Hebrew app，is especially applied to the birth of eminent persons．（Grot．and Kain．）Muxpó－ тapos，for $\mu \iota \kappa \rho \delta \dot{\tau} \alpha \tau o s$. See Wider＇s Gr．Gr．p． 87.
 pensation is forcibly seized and impetuously oc－













cupied．The following clause is closely con－ nected with the present；and if it be，as some say，a repetition of the same sentiment，Blagzal will denote men of ardent minds．And so Chrys． and Whitby take the expression．This，how－ ever，（Middlet．observes，）would require the Art．Hence he acquiesces in the common inter－ pretation，and takes $\beta$ ta $a$ al to denote men who had lived by rapine and violence，such as the publicans and sinners，and generally the pro－ fanum vulgus of the Jews：the former，however， is the more natural and simple mode of under－ standing the words．

13．тdиres－тооeфทirevaav］The sense （somewhat obscure from brevity）is made clearer by regarding trooed，as put emphatically．We may paraphrase：＇For all the prophets and other sacred writers of the law（i．e．revelation）of God，and its expounders up to the time of John， did but foreshow the dispensation，which should hereafter be promulged，whereas Joh．announced it as at hand．The words following aútb́s dot $\iota$ \＆xc．are exegetical of the preceding．

14．el $\theta$ enere dézar0al］An impressive form－ ula，like the $\dot{c}$ exwu－dкovéro just afterwards， one soliciting pationt attention，the other implicit faith．At dikaotal sub．тoüro．This sense of Sifxeo日at，credore，both with the Accus．，and used absolutely，is frequent in the Classical writers．Aurds eorry＇Hitas，iv．e．this is the person described by Malachi iv．5．under that name．On the typical semblance between John the Baptist and Elijah，see Lightf．Mede，Whit－ by，and Mackn．

15．© ${ }^{4}$ Xcov－iкovérco］A formula often used， to solicit attention to something of great impor－ tance，and never occurring but after parabolic or prophetic declarations figuratively expressed．

16．Tive $\left.\delta \dot{\delta} \delta \mu o \omega^{\circ} \sigma \omega\right]$ A form of introducing a parable frequent in the Seriptures and the Tal－ mud．IIadolots．In this reading all the Editors from Wets．to Fritz．acquiesce，instead of the common one ratoapioss，which has very little avthority．＇Opoía dort．This only denotes that there is a general similarity，by which the two thinge compared may be mutually illustrated． ＇Ayopais means not only market places，beat those broad places in the streets，especially where they intersect each other，whieh are places of con－ course like market placen．Hesce the words
ajopal and $\pi$ गגareial are often in the Sept．used indifferently for the same Heb．word．Kafyodas is said to be，like the Hebrew $⿴ 囗 十$ ，used in the sense versari，esse．Yet it may allude to the posture，so suitable to Eastern manners．
 verbial expression，in which there is a reference to the dramatic sports of children who，in their phraseology，＇play at＇（i．e．represent）some ac－ tion or character．So the Pharisees are com－ pared to wayward children，who will participate in no play which their companions propoee； since they neither would admit the severe pre－ cepts of John，nor approve the mild requisitions of Jesus．

18．y $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \theta$ e］This is not redundant，as the Com－ mentators say，but signifies，＇came forward as a teacher and prophet．＇Mrre iölionv Mifre тivcos．An hyperbolical expression well chas－ racterizing the ascetic austerity of John．By the force of the opposition，dotion kal stivan fol－ lowing must denote the contrary to that austerity， namely the living like other men；$\Delta a<\mu \delta \dot{v} c o s$ exel，＇the man is possessed or mad．＇

19．Kal \＆\＆каte $\theta_{\eta}-a u r \bar{j} \mathrm{~s}$ ］There is scarcely any passage in the New Testament that has been more variously expounded．Not a few of the different interpretations are specions；yet almost all are liable to objections．The most probable methods are the following－1．To take the sen－ tence as a reflection of our Lord on the Pharisees， thus：＂But when the perverseness of men has done its utmost in aspersing the preachers of true religion，wisdom and virtue will still vindicate themselves；and the methods of Divine Provi－ dence，in its several dispensations of mercy to mankind，will finally appear to be wise and good．＇ 2．To understand by oopha the counsels of God for the conversion of the Jews；and by Tiкx． those who embrace those counsels．And in this view the sentence has been thus paraphrased ：－ －The conduct of John the Baptist and myself， however different，are alike conformable to the divine wisdom；and those who are enlightened by this wisdom will justify both，＇i．e．will vindi－ cate the propriety of both，as the result of dif－ ferent cireumstances．The seeond interpretation seeme preferable，as more agreeable to the context．In either case the кal is for $d \lambda \lambda \alpha$ ，as often．














21．oúai $\sigma 01]$＇Alas for thee！＇B $\eta \theta \sigma a i \delta \alpha \dot{\text { a }}$ ． This reading（for the common one B $\eta \theta \sigma a i \delta \alpha \nu$ ）is found in most of the MSS．and in the Edit． Princeps．，as also in several Versions and Fathers； and is adopted and preferred by every Editor from Mill to Fritz．，except Griesb．，who has（on what grounds it does not appear）retained the common reading．Ma入al．This signifies not so much dis，es jamdie．עáккч，from the Hebrew pw，a coume cloth of linen or rough wool，worn for humiliation，as ashes were aprinkled on the head in token of sorrown．
22．גу иимípq крifees］This may be taken of judgmeat and punishment both in this world and in the mext．The first prediction was fully veri－ fied in the war with the Romans．
 botic expresaions，figuratively representing the beight of prosperity and deep adversity，in which cheov aignifies the grave or the lower parts of the earth．Of these samerous examples are adduced by Wets．and others；as Autholog．i．80．15．els
 werdyec．
26．$\dot{d v}$ dхаіу甲 $\tau \overline{\text { ® }}$ каир甲 ］This is thought to be a somswhat indefnite expression，equiyalent to ＇about that timas．＇But that will depend on the interpretation of the words following．＇Aжокрь－ Oeir afree：this expression is here，an sometimes closwhere，used，where nothing has sone before to which an answer could be accomsoodated；in which most Commentators（as Kuin．）suppose a pleonasm of $\dot{\alpha} \pi<\kappa \rho i \theta$ eis；others，a Hebraism， pre being cometimes so used．See Gesen，or Parkh．Heb．Lex．There must，however，be sume recton for the use of cither torm；and Whit－ by seems right in supposing that there is usually a relation to something ；i．e．to something which is paesing in the mind either of the speaker or bearer，i．e．（as Fritz．seys）to some supposed guestion，surppressed from brevity，to which this man answer；（（See Matth，xxii．1．Lu．v．22．vii． 39．sq．）or to some question which might aries from certain actions．See Mark ix， 38 ．Lu．i． 00 ；xxii． 51 ．＇REqonoyoümal co4．This verb property eignifies to acknowledge，with an ellipsis of xderv，（obligation）；and è consequenti，to re－ curn thanke，to praise and glorify．This secon－ dary sense it carries when followed by a Dative，
and often occurs in the Sept．，where the same
 aiveiv，and íuveĩ．
－д̀ть аंтєкричаs－$\nu \eta \pi i o c s]$ The best Com－ mentators，antient and modern，are agreed that the sense is，＇because，having permitted these things to be hidden to the wise and able，thou hast revealed them unto children in knowledge．＇ For God is said in Scripture to do what he is pleased to permit to be done，and what he foresess will be done under the circumstances in which his creatures are placed，though their wills are held under no constraint．With respect to the former idiom，it occurs in Rom．vi．17．Is，xii． 1. Exod．vii． 4 and 5． 2 Sam．xii． 11 and 12 ；and often elsewhere，nay，sometimes in the Classical writers．See Fritz．The ooфol and the ouverol are thought to have reference to the Hebrew ניבוני，different orders of Jewish teachers of the law．Perhaps，however，that is two fanciful，and $\sigma 0 \phi o l$ has reference to acquired knowledge，and $\sigma u v e r o l$ ，to natural talents．The $\nu \eta \pi$ ．，by the force of the opposition， denotes persons of plain and simple understand－ ing，with no pretentions to any kind of ability．
26．עal－©ov］＇E ${ }^{\circ}$ onoloyoünal must be re－ peated．＇O жarip．Nomin．for Vocat．An Idiom chiefly occurring in Heb．and Hellenistic Greek，but occasionally in the Classical writers， Greek and Latin．The öTt is omphatical．We may render：＇Yea I do thank thee，O Father， because so it was thy good pleasure it should be． At oivrous some verb must be supplied，either
 braism for $\sigma$ ol．
27．Taivra］On the subject of the diecourse the Commentators differ ；some explaining it generally of all power．And so most of the antients took it． Others understand it of persons．The former is more probable；but the context requires that we should，with some of the best Commentators， take xavra to mean adl things relating to the counsels of God for the salvation of man．Hap－ e $\delta \dot{6} 0 \eta$ ，＇were communicated and taught．＇，So Joh．
 тi $\mu_{\psi}$ аитós $\mu \epsilon$ ．And comp．John xvii． 7 and 8. This doctrine of the subondination of the Son to the Father，and the origination of the attributes of Divinity with the Father，when connected with
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what we elsewhere learn of their equality and majesty co-eternal, and that which follows of the reciprocal knowledge of the same Persons, in. volves a mystery which the human understanding cannot penetrate. See Chrys. and Grot.
 understand these words of the Jews, with reference to the burdens of the ceremonial law; and the additional injunctions of the Rabbis, called
 Others refer them to the labours of temptation and sin. Thus, there might be reference both to the Jews and Gentiles. And indeed it seems best to take them, with Chrys. Origen, and Theophyl., (cited in Recens. Synop.) of both Jews and Gentiles, as meant to apply as the case might be ; to the Jews, in both senses, to the Gentiles, in the latter; and divãavio will be interpreted accordingly.
29. $\langle\rho a \tau e-i \mu 0\rangle]$ These words are exegetical of the preceding; and the sense 'become my disciples,' is expressed in metaphors familiar to the Jews, and not unfrequent with the Gentiles, whereby a law or precept is called a yoke, by a metaphor taken from oxen which are in harness. See Schleus. or Wahl., or Parkh. by Rose, and the examples adduced in Recens. Synop. $\Pi$ I $\rho$ ăós denotes 'gentle, unassuming, and condescending;' as opposed to the tyranny and haughtiness of the Scribes and Pharisees. The cluuse $\pi \rho \overline{\mathrm{a}}$ '́s -кapsia is, in some measure, parenthetical, and meant to recommend himself to their choice as a teacher. 'Avdixavars denotes not only relief from the burdens of the Jewish ceremonial law, but all the comforts and blessings of the Gospel, both in this world and in the next.
30. xpnotor] As spoken of a burden, the word denotes what is convenient, and suitable to the strength of the bearers, eispopov.
 phrase, not necessarily connecting what follows
with the preceding. The exact time is indicated by Lu. vi. i. $\sum \dot{\alpha} \beta \beta \alpha \sigma \iota$. This term (by the usage of both the Sept. and New Testament ) has only the force of a singular. $\Sigma$ wop! $\mu \omega \nu$. Sub. xwo $i \omega \nu$. See Bos. TiAdelv conjoined with dofícin, implies what Luke expresses by $\psi$ cixovтes.
 a disputed point ; for though Moses had forbidden all servile work on the Sabbath day, it was a controverted point what was and what was not such. Reaping was admitted to fall under the former clase ; and plucking of ears being a sort of reaping, was forbidden by the more rigid Rabbis. This, however, was contrary to the spirit of the law. See Exod. xii. 16. But our Lord only meets the accusation, by showing that the thing was not done presumptuously, but from necessity, on the score of which he shows that even the ceremonial law may be dispensed with.
3. aivors] This has no place in many of the MSS., and some Versions ; and has been thrown out, or disapproved, by almost all the Editors from Mill to Vater, but is retained by Matthei and Fritz. As its authenticity is doubtful, it may be proper to bracket it.
4. ofiov тoü $\theta_{\epsilon \text { eī] }}$ Not the Temple, (which was not then built) but the court of the Tabernacle, which preceded it. Kuin. understands the portico or vestibule of the Temple. 'R $\xi \delta \nu \bar{\eta} \nu$, for $d \xi \eta \nu$. E $l \mu \eta$ is for $d \lambda \lambda \alpha$ when a negative has preceded; which is called a Hebraism, but it is occasionally found in the Classical writern. See Recens. Synop. Homberg and Fritz. however, make el $\mu \dot{\eta}$ dependent upon ${ }^{〔} \xi \neq \nu$, assigning an exceptive, not an adversative force.
5. $\beta \in \beta \eta \lambda$ ö̈бt $]$ Not really so, but кaтà rd in $\boldsymbol{j} \delta \nu$, as those are said to violate a law, by doing what, unless the worship of God had excused it, it would not have been lawful for them to do. So the Rabbins speak when they say that the Sabbath is rightly violated by doing such and
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such Sacerdotal works．（Grot．and Maldon．） Fritz．thinks that $\beta e \beta$ ．has reference to the false notion of the Pharisees．

6．Tout ícpoü－wíc］Our Lord here anticipates an objection；q．d．＇But you are no Priest，nor is your work for the benefit of the Temple．＇To which he does not directly reply，＇I am one greater than the Temple；＇but，modestly and de－ licately，＇here is one greater than the Temple．＇ Thus those engaged in his service，may be allowed an equal liberty with the priests．Meǐov，which is preferred by nearly all the Editors and Com－ mentators，and edited by Math．and Fritz．，is evidently the true reading；being found in the greater part of the MSS．，the Edit．Princ．and many of the Greek Fathers．The sens is the same，（neut．for masc．）as further on at ver． 41. ：
 क्रोeion Eohopmentos，and Luke xi．31．

7．el od dүขшóкеเтек．т．入．］A refined mode of asserting the excellency of any thing．＂Eneov and $\theta v \sigma$ ．stand respectively for the virtues of charity and benevolence，and those of the cere－ monial law．Taus àaltious；meaning Christ and his Apostles．

8．кúpcos－av0 cózov］Grot．and many mi－ pent Commentators（as recently Guin．）maintain that $\dot{o}$ vide sou $\alpha \nu \theta \rho$ ónsou here signifies $a$ man，or man；which may seem to be countenanced by the parallel passage of Mark ii．28；and by the yap here，to which wi $\sigma \epsilon$ corresponds there．But in all the other passages of the New Testament （eighty－seven in number，according to Whitby，） where it occurs，the expression signifies the son of man，the Messiah，which sense also the Article requires；whereas vide sou $\alpha \nu \theta$ р由́sou without the Art．as invariably denotes a son of man，a man． Neither does the ©̈न Tc in the above passage com－ pel us to take the phrase to denote man，since it may be continuative，introductory of a new argo－ meat，and signify moreover，of which sense see examples in Hoogev．Part．As to the raj of the present passage，it may refer to something not expressed，but merely what was passing in the mind of the speaker；an idiom very frequent in the Classical writers，especially Thucyd．And here the suppression is evidently from the same
cause that produced the use of $\mu \in i \check{\}}$ on for $\mu \in i\} \cos \nu$ ． It will clear the construction to consider ver． 7. as parenthetical，and to refer the $\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ to soma clause connected with ver． 6 ；q．d．＇There is one here greater than the Temple，（and his sane－ cion will warrant the breach of any such ceremo－ nil institution as that of the Sabbath）；for the son of man，＇\＆c．The sal before той $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta a \dot{r} \boldsymbol{r}$ which is bracketed，is not found in the great body of the MSS．，nor in the Editio Prince．，nor in se－ veral of the Greek Fathers；and is cancelled by Math．，Griesb．，Knapp．，Vater，Fritz．，and Scholz．，as having probably been introduced from the parallel passages of Mark and Luke．Yet I must consider it as genuine，because it was so much more likely to be omitted than added．

9．aiT $\bar{\omega} \nu$ ］i．e．of the people to whom he had gone．

10．रeipa Enpalv］Not，＇a partial paralysis，＇ as some suppose；but，according to the most accurate inquirers，（See Recens．Synop．）an atrophy of the limb，occasioned by an evaporation of the vital juices，involving an inability to move the nerves and muscles；which must also be the sense at 1 Kings xii．4．El ékeort \＆cc．A modest form of negation．As the interrogation is not direct，there should be no mark of interrogation， as in all the Editions except that of Fritz．From the Rabbinical citations，it appears that it had been decided unlawful to heal any one on the Sabbath day，unless when in imminent peril of life．Прóßato＂av．Not，＇one sheep，＇but a sheep，as Waken．explains．At $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\nu} \dot{\dot{c}} \mu \pi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \boldsymbol{y}$ there is a Hebrew or Hellenistic construction．Some， too，suppose an anacoluthon at out крarviबeb： But this is rightly rejected by Fritz．Wakef，well renders，＇and it fall into a pit，will not＇\＆c． ＇Erepeĭ，＇will pull it out．＇A rare sense of the word，of which the Commentators adduce an example from Philo．This was allowed by the earlier Rabbis，but forbidden by the later ones．

12．oũv］atqui．Ka 入ल̄s roteìv，＇to do good．＇
13．$\alpha$ токатсот ${ }^{\prime} \theta \eta$ ．］The word properly sig－ nifies to bring any thing back to its former situation，or state；and figuratively，to restore to health，as in the Sept．and some later writers． See Elan．＇I rigs，sound，healthy．
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 the sense is obvious. 'REe $\lambda$ Óovtes must be taken with è $\lambda a \beta o \nu$, and underatood of departure from the synagogue.
17. ̈̈́ $\pi \cos \pi \lambda_{\eta \rho \omega} \theta$ 万ु] See Note suprai. 22.
18. İoú, $\dot{\delta}$ waīs $\mu \circ \mathrm{ov}$.] This prophecy, from Is. xiii. 1., differs somewhat from the Hebrew, and yet more from the Sept., which is supposed to have been corrupted; and the words 'I $\alpha \kappa \omega \dot{\beta}$ and 'I $\sigma \rho a \eta \lambda$ (of which there are no traces in the Heb., ) are suspected to have been inserted by the Jews, that the passage might not be applied to the Mesiah. The Evangelist has shown the true application of the prophecy, the chief import of which is centred in the second verse; and the whole predicts the quiet and unpretending mode in which Christ promulgated his religion, not resorting to violence or clamour, or offering resistance to oppression ; but employing the mildest means whereby it should be spread over all the nations of the universe. Hoétıra. The verb denotes properly to chuse, and thence, as here, to esteom, love, and favour.
20. калдамоу $\rightarrow \beta \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma e t$ ] These are lively emblems of great weakness, and almost expiring debility ; importing profound humility, contrition, and meekness. Aivov here denotes the wick of a lamp, so called from its materials. Here (as often in the Classical writers) by the negation of one thing is implied the affirmation of the contrary, i. e. he will strengthen wavering faith, and will rekindle nearly extinct piety. The words following äws áv é $\kappa \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda\rangle \eta$ \&c. are variously interpreted. The usual, and perhaps true explanation is, 'until he make his Gospelvictorious, and thoroughly establish his religion.' See Is. xLii. 4. And certainly $\kappa$ piots, as answering to
the Heb. עמשמ, must signify a divine law, or rule of life; and the Art. will, as often, stand for the poseessive pronoun. It has, too, been
 signify to render victorious.
 Gentiles trust (for instruction and preservation).' The $\varepsilon v$ is omitted in various MSS., the Edit. Princ., and some Fathers, is marked for omission by Wets., and Vater, and is cancelled by Matthæi, Griesb., and Fritz.
23. dEiनтavтo] ' were greatly amazed.' The word properly signifies, by an ellips. of toù yoū, to be thrown out of one's mind, and to be greatly astonished; by the same metaphor as we say to be frightened out of one's wits, for to be exceedingly frightened. Mítı, num, not nonнe ; for, as Campb. remarks, the former implies that disbelief preponderates; the latter, belief. The multitude seems to have spoken thus modestly, to avoid offending the Pharisees.
24. ápXoutt $\tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ datmovicov] Not only was an hierarcly of good angels held, but a subordination and headship was believed to exist among the evil ones. And this not only by the Incantatores and Enorcista, \&c., but by the Philosophers. So also in the Rabbinical writings, the expressions rex dcmonum, caput diabolorum, and such like, often occur.
 verbial saying, (similar to many cited from the Classical and Rabbinical writers,) in which there is (as Kuin. observes) an argumentum ab absurdo ; q. d. 'The safety of a state or a family is produced by concord, and is destroyed by dissensions. If Satan were to aexist me in expelling his dæmons from the bodies of men, whither












the has empowered them to enter, he would be at discord with himself, and would act foolishly, and his authority could not continue. 'E $\rho \eta \mu \rho \bar{\tau} \tau \alpha \iota$ is a Present tense denoting custom; and $\sigma \tau a \theta \eta \eta^{\prime}-$ revas may be rendered will not, cannot stand.
26. кal el $\dot{j}$ бaravãs.] The кal is taken by Bera for dilda; by Kuin. in the sense quodsi. But it is better, with Fritz., to render it etium, $\infty$ also. The subject of the sentence (he remarks) is interposed with the condition of the enunciation. Of which he adduces several exanples.
 ste. That there were several among the Jews who professed to cast out demons by exorcisms, and the invocation of the God of Abraham, Lease and Jacob, we learn both from the Scriptares (see Lu. xix. 49. Acts xix. 13. Mark ix. 38.) and from Joseph. Ant. viii. 2, 5. vii. 6, 3., the early Fathers, (as .Justin Martyr, Irenzus, Origen, Tertullian, and others) and Lucian Trag. p. 171. The argument therefore is, 'If those who cast out demons prove themselves to be leagued with Satan, then must your disciples be also leagued with him, and the censure apply to them as well as unto as.' It affects not the argument whether the demons were really expelled by such exorcism ; (though it might sometimes happen by the permission of God, and at others, when it was mere phrenzy, be effected by surong medicaments) it is sufficient that the Pharisees thought they were expelled, and did not aturibute it to the agency of Satan. Miol, by as idiom derived from the customs of the Jews, desates disciples.
 tion;' as in Lu. xi. 20. Єע daктúlıe Өeoü. See Middlet. G. A. p. 168 . The reasoning is thus ctated by Rocenm. and Wets. 'If I cast out devils by divine power, I perform miracles by the aid of God: hence it follows, that I am sent from God. But if I be a divine messenger, you should believe me, when I announce to you the kingdom of God. And if (as all must confess) he that binds another is stronger than he who is bound by him, you will easily perceive that I muat be far more powerful than the prince of demposs.' "Bфөarey. Schmid and Fritz. take this to be a mtrong expression, signifying 'is come upon you before you are aware. Perhaps it may mean, 'is already come upon you.' The in
may be rendered, with Erasm., alioqui; or, with Fritz., 'vel, (ut aliter vobis occurram).'
30 .' $\dot{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \dot{\omega} \nu \& c$.] q. d. since I act by a power superior to, and in opposition to him, it follows that I am his enemy, according to the adage, He who is not, \&c. In ouváycon \&c. there is not, as Kuin. supposes, an allusion to the amassing of money, on the one hand, and its dissipation, on the other; but it is an agricultural, or possibly a pastoral, metaphor, taken from forking together hay or corn, or gathering and folding sheep. 31. סLa тои̃тo.] This relates to the whole of the preceding discourse, q. d. ' Wherefore because ye have thus calumniated me.' $\Lambda e ́ \gamma \omega$ í $\mu i \bar{\nu}$ is a formula ushering in something of serious and solemn import. B $\alpha \sigma \phi \boldsymbol{q}_{\mu}\{a$, i. e. calumny or injurious expressions whether against God or man ; the former being properly termed blasphemy, the latter detraction. 'A $\phi$ eण or may, be pardoned,' i. e. on sincere repentance, which is always implied. 'H той חиеúmatos $\beta \lambda a \sigma \phi \eta \mu i \alpha$. There is scarcely any point more debated than the nature of the blasphemy here pronounced never to be forgiven. It is clearly connected with the diabolical perversity of the Pharisees in ascribing the acknowledged miracles of our Lord to the power of the Devil. Comp. Mark iii. 28-30. But Commentators are not agreed whether it was the present conduct of the Pharisees which constituted the sin ; or whether it consisted in wilful and malicious blasphemy of the gifts of the Holy Ghost which were to be poured forth, when the grand dispensation of it should open after the resurrection and ascension of Christ. The former is the more general opinion, and is maintained by the antient Fathers and some of the most eminent of the modern Commentators and Theologians. The latter is supported by Whitby, Doddr., and Mackn., whose arguments seem, indeed, cogent, but are perhaps outweighed by those on the other side. And when we consider that the latter involves a certain harshness, while the former is strongly supported by the connexion and context, it would seem to deserve the preference. Besides, the former may include the latter, but not vice versa. Our Saviour seems to have meant to include blasphemy against the Holy Ghost whether residing, as it always did, in himself without measure, or whether occasionally and limitedly in the Apostles after his ascension.
p Luc. 6.
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 a common proverb importing never. See the Rabbinical citations in Recens. Synop. For presumptuous sins, like this, no expiation was provided, even under the Jewish law. Toúte T $\bar{\varphi}$. The greater part of the MSS., the Edit. Princ., and the two former of Steph., with many Fathers, have $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{\nu} \nu$, which is confirmed by 1 Tim. vi. 17. 2 Sam. iv. 10. Tit. iv. 10., preferred by Wets., and edited by Matthæi. And this I should have received, had it not been entirely destitute of support from the earliest Vensions, and been liable to some suspicion of having arisen ex interpretatione. Yet as the reading here is doubtful, I have affixed an $\ddagger$.
33. in пoぃifare, \&c.] ponite, suppose. A Latinism for $\tau$ t $\theta$ ere. (See the examples adduced by Raphel and Kypke.) q. d. Account the tree as good which produces good fruit; or the tree bad which produces bad fruit. The goodness of my doctrine argues its divine origin, as good fruit a good tree. This, too, has the air of a proverb; and I have in Recens. Synop. adduced two very similar passages from Dionys. Hal.
 verbial expression, with which Wets. compares
 Aristid. olos ó трótos, тoloütos кal ò 入óos.
 $\pi \rho о ф е ́ \rho є$. It is not, however, a Hebraism, as some say; for examples are adduced from the best Greek writers. The sense is, 'A good man, from the repository of kind affections, throws out, or brings forth candid opinions, and equitahle decisions; wicked men have within them a treasury of pride, enmity. and malice, which they vent in slanderous and injurious language.' Kapòias is omitted in the greater part of the MSS., the Edit.

Princ., and several Versions and Fathers, and is cancelled, or rejected by all the Editors from Mill downwards. It was, no doubt, inserted from the preceding verse, or the parallel passage in Luke. The $\tau \dot{a}$ before $d \gamma \alpha \theta \dot{a}$ I have bracketed, as having no place in very many MSS., the Edit. Princ., and Matthei, and being liable to the strong objections stated by Middlet. Some, indeed, as Raphel, Wets., and Fritz., seek a peculiar sense arssing from the addition of the Art. to $\alpha^{\alpha} \gamma a \theta \dot{\alpha}$, and its rejection after movnf $\dot{\alpha}$. But on the sense itself they widely differ; and, in short, such an interpretation is too fanciful to be admitted.
36. dopóv.] On the sense of this word there has been no little debate. Some explain it rash, vain, unedifying. And there is something to countenance this in the Heb. בטל. But although that sense (which is ably supported by Wets.) may be not inapposite, yet it is not so probable as that of useless, pernicious, in which there is a litotes common to many words of similar signification. See the examples in Recens. Synop. The context and scope of the passage, however, most recommends the interpretation of Chrys., Whitby, and Campb., false; though there seems to be a reference to falsehood combined with calumny, such as the Pharisees were guilty of. With respect to the construction, there is here a Nom. absolute, occasioned by the abandonment of the construction.
39. $\mu \circ \div \chi \alpha \lambda$ is.] This is by some understood of spiritual adultery, i. e. idolatry. But of that there is no reason to think the Jews were then guilty. Others would take it to denote apurious, degenerated from the piety of their ancestors; which is harsh and liable to objection. The term may either be taken of adultery in the proper sense ; or rather, I would suggest, of practical





















infidelity by sinful habits. For the covenant with which the Jewish nation was typified as having entered into with God might be broken by that as much as by idolatry. So, too, I find the term was taken by some of the antients. See Suic. Thes. i. 745. Td $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \bar{i} o \nu$ ' $\mathbf{I} \omega \nu \bar{a}$, q. d. ' the proof of my divine legation shall be an event similar to what happened to Jonah.
 posed) another large fish called Lamia. 'E $\nu$ Tî̀
 $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\eta}$; though a similar expression occurs in our own and other languages.
41. ajujpes NLyevira..] This pleonasm of a $\nu \partial \rho e s$ is common in the Greek writers, and may be considered a vestige of the wordiness of primi-
 aioriv. There is something refined, and perhaps Oriental, in the turn of this and the next verse, by which the Ninevites and the Queen are supposed to bear testimony against the Jews as to the transactions here mentioned, and by that testimony, be the means of increasing the condemnation of the Jews by the contrast.
42. T< $\rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu \tau \bar{\eta} s \gamma^{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \mathrm{s}$.] A usual phrase to denote a remote country; of which examples are adduced by Wets. and others, may be seen in Recens. Synop. Dodouल̄vos. This reading is preferred, (from several MSS. and the Edit. Princ., ) by all the best Editors.

43-45. The difficulty of this parable is not in itself, but in its connerion, whether with the preceding, or the following, and how. Some think it intended for the beneft of certain of our Lord's converts; others suppose it directed against the Jews. If it were, as some say, meant for the

Pharises, who had been demanding a sign, the most probable interpretation would be that of Kaufmann, cited by Kuin.; q. d. ' Though I were to give you a sign from heaven, yet the effect would be but momentary ; the demon of infidelity and obstinacy would return, and seizing you with greater violence, increase your final condemnation.' That, however, is liable to objection. By $\tau \tilde{p} \gamma \in \nu \in \tilde{a}$ raúry must be meant the Jews in general ; and the most probable interpretation is that' of Fritz., who thus paraphrases, ' I presage that these kind of persons will some time perhaps be moved by the truth of my doctrine to depart from their usual perversity. But of no long continuance will be this conversion, nay, they will return to their former infatuation, insomuch that they will hate me more than ever.' As to the minor circumstances of the parable, they are merely meant for ornament, and accommodated to the notions of the Jews as to the haunts and habits of demons, which they thought chiefly abode év $\boldsymbol{\tau o i ̈ s} d \nu u \delta \rho o i ̄ s$, in the deserts.
44. $\sigma$ Хо $\lambda a ́ \zeta o \nu+a]$ i. e. ready for his reception. The word is elsewhere almost always used of a
 pression.
46. oi $\dot{\partial} \dot{0} \in \lambda \phi o i]$ i.e. either brethren, or kinsmen, cousins; for it is disputed which is the true sense. The latter is the antient and more usual opinion; and of this use of the term brother the Scriptures furnish many examples. Yet not a few modern Commentators maintain that the word must be taken in the usual sense; as Matt. xiii. 25. Eloriккєioav has the termination of a Pluperf., but the sense of a Perf. ; of which examples are adduced by Wers


















 notice the ellips. of wis, quasi, and compare a similar one of the Heb. $J$; also adducing examples of a similar idion in Greek and Latin. But, as Fritz. has rightly remarked, no ellip. must here be supposed.
 See Lu. v. 17.
2. To $\pi$ तoiov.] The Art. may denote either the vessel kept for Jesus, or one belonging to the Apostles; or, indeed, both. See Middlet.
3. mapaßo入ais.] The word $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \beta o \lambda \eta$ is used with the same extent of signification as the Hebrew bems, and denotes properly a comparison of one thing with another in similitude or dissimilitude, or an illustration of any thing derived from any other thing. It differs from an example, which is only an instance in kind. But 2dly it signifies a fable, story, or apologue; 3dly an enigmatical and wittily expressed gnome or saying, or moral maxim; 4thly an adage, proverb, or apothegm. Of all which senses the Scriptures afford examples. The second is the one now especially under consideration. It consists of two parts; 1. the image, or similitude, in which oume event or fact, real or fictitious, is narrated. and comparison made between natural and spiritual things, in order thereby to convey important moral or religious instruction, in a more vivid and impressive manner than in the didactic style. 2. The $\alpha \nu \tau a \pi o ́ \delta o \sigma t s$, which subjoins the thing of which the foregoing was an image ; that in which the similitude consists. This dvtanódoase is, however, sometimes wanting, and as that is added or omitted, $s 0$ is the parable termed perfect, or imperfect. The parabolical narrations of Christ (in which were contained facts obvious and striking the senses, or fictitious, in accommodation to the popular comprehension) were generally destitute of this divtasódogss, and were of two sorts; 1, what regarded the illustration of
moral doctrines and the duties of life; 2, what signified obscurely and sub involucris, the nature of the divine kingdom, and its future fortunes. Of these a clear comprehension was so much the more difficult, because it could not be attained without the previous understanding of some other matters which required to be expounded by Jesus himself. Yet when parables of this sort are to be interpreted, we must avoid a too minute scrupulosity; we must not resecare omnia ad latum unguem, but rather regard their general intent and purpose ; and since rarely does any parable correspond in every part to the thing compared, many circumstances will occur which belong only to poetical or Oriental ornament, and are considered as a sort of drapery. See more in Campb. and Rec. Syn.

- o $\sigma$ weipwv.] The Art. (as Middlet. remarks) here gives the participle the nature of a substantive, i.e. $\sigma \pi o p e u ̀ s$, which was unknown to the ixx. This is not a Hebraism, but is frequent in the Greek Classical writers. See Matth. Gr. Gr. 6269.
 by, or in the path which led to the field about to be sowed.

5. тà $\pi$ eтpeid̀ $]$ Sub. Xopia, which is erpressed in Thucyd. iv. 9. The sense is, stony or rocky ground.
6. ikavpariody.] In Palestine, during the seed time (which is in November), the sky is generally ovenspread with clouds. The seed then springs up even in stony places: but when the sun dissipates the clouds, having outgrown its strength, it is quickly dried away. (Rosenm.)
 rather, upon thorny ground. So Polyæn. p. 615. Xupiov dкavecödes. Bp. Middlet. has not said any thing on the force of the Art. in this and the following verse. It may be considered an in-
















sertion in reference; and that reference should seem to be to the thorny ground, and the good ground, as parts of a whole, namely of the field to be sown.
7. $\dot{\text { E }} \mathbf{i \delta \delta o v ] ~ g a v e , ~ y i e l d e d . ~ T h i s ~ s e n s e ~ o f ~} \delta \delta \delta o \mu \mathrm{c}$ and the Latin dare is frequent in the Classical writers. $\hat{\delta} \mu \dot{\nu} \nu$. Sub. бтépua. 'Eкатóv. This immense produce is not unexampled. See Wets. and Recens. Synop. It is not, however, necessary to press on the expression, since a most abundant harvest is all that is required to be supposed.
 by God.' Muotripia. This does not mean things entirely beyond the reach of the human understanding. The word properly denotes something hidden, withheld, and therefore unknown, either wholly or partly. All mystery has been well said to be 'imperfect knowledge.' Here and elsewhere in the New Testament it denotes something oaly disclosed to certain persons, and not revealed to the multitude; namely, in the present case, not the fundamental precepts of the Gospel, but such mysteries as the rejection of the Jews, and the preaching of the Gospel to the Gentiles. These were things not in themselves obscure, nor withheld from any desire to conceal pecessary truth, but only that the things in question were, for various reasons, not proper to be then communicated to all, but reserved in their complete explication, for the ol $\ell \sigma \omega \tau \epsilon \rho \iota \kappa o l$ of the disciples. That our Lord spake in parables, to cause the blindness, perverseness, and final condemnation of the Jews, it would be impious to imagine.
8. ö orts $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ é $\chi \in!$-aùroū.] This adage, partaking of the oxymoron, which has a twofold application, properly (and as it was, no doubt, commonly used) refers to worldly riches; for ol exoures and oi $\mu$ i éxovтes, (scil. хрй $\mu a \tau \alpha$ ) is a frequent phrase in the Classical writers to denote the have-somethings, and the have-nothings, the rich and the poor. And in this view the adage ean little need explication. Here, however, it
is transferred to spiritual riches, and under it is couched the lesson that he who hath considerable religious knowledge, and takes that care to improve it, with which men are observed to increase their wealth, will find it increase; while those who have but little, and manage it as the poor are often observed to do, will find it come to nothing. The little he hath learned will slip out of his memory; he will be deprived of it, and in that sense it will be taken from him.
 expression, common to both the Scriptural and the Classical writers, used of those who employ to advantage the faculties of seeing or perceiving, hearing or understanding, and laying to heart.
9. кal dंvā入 $\eta \rho o u ̄ \tau a t$ ] i. e. is again fulfilled, by the similar blind obstinacy of the same people. This is what Spanh. calls the secondary and improper use of the formula, by analogy, or example, when a thing happens similar to one that has formerly been done, said, or predicted. There is, however, no reason why it may not be understood of a second fulfilment. 'Акой дкои́oerc. This is called a Hebraism, though examples have been adduced from the Greek Classical writers. The idiom almost always carries emphasis. ' $E \pi l$ before $\dot{\alpha} \kappa$. is marked for omission, or cancelled, by almost all the Editors: and on the strongest grounds, it being omitted in most Manuscripts and Versions, and the Edit. Princ.
 pinguis in Latin) are often used of stupidity, from a notion common to all ages, that fat tends to mental dulness. But as with us stupidity is colloquially used in the sense obstinacy, so here both senses seem to be meant. This, indeed, is certain from what follows. 'Eкג́ $\mu \nu \bar{\sigma} a \nu$. Ка $\mu$ $\mu \nu ́ \epsilon t \nu$ does not mean to squint, as a recent Commentator says, but to close the eyelids. Míтотe,
 Princ. and many MSS., and is edited by Matth., Griesb., Knapp., Vater, and Fritz.
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10. $\mu а к \dot{\alpha} \rho t o t ~ o i ~ o ̀ ~ \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o i.] ~ A ~ m o d e ~ o f ~ s p e a k-~$ ing common to the poetic or the pathetic and spirited style, in every language. The same remark will apply to Lu. xi. 27.
11. $\dot{\alpha}$ кои́бате $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda \eta \nu$. .] ' Hear ye, or attend ye, therefore to the (explanation of) the parable of the sower.'
12. Mij $\sigma u v i e ́ v \tau o s]$ i.e. and does not lay it to heart so as to understand it ; by metonymy of cause for effect. This signification is of frequent occurrence in the Sept. Mayтós dкoúovtos may, with Fritz., be rendered ' quicunque audit.' Perhaps, however, it is Hebraism. ' 0 -o $\pi$ apcis. He who is such may metaphorically be called a man sown by the way-side. A man may be termed sown ( $\sigma \pi$ apcis) on the same principle that we call a field sown, which receives the seed. It may be rendered, he who is sown on the way-side. For the man is compared to the ficld, not to the seed. And so E. V. Hammond and Campb., however, understand it of the seed. And so Fritz., who renders :hic ex parabolæ ingenio ad viam consitus appellari debet.'
13. oúк éxet $\dot{\rho}\left\}_{\alpha \nu}\right.$.] It is properly the word that hath no root in itself. Comp. Col. ii. 7. Eph. iii. 18. But, by hypallage, it is transferred to the persin. We may paraplirase, 'but he does not suffer it to take deep root in his mind.'

 fence at, and falls off from the Gospel.'
 because $\mu$ epifet $\tau \dot{\delta} \nu \nu o u ̈ \nu$, it distracts the mind with worldly cares, and so dissipates the atten"ion as not to leave us (in the words of Gray) "leisure to be wise or good," or to attend to the concerns of the soul. Axárך той тлoútov, the alluring vanity of riches.
14. $\dot{\delta} \delta \dot{\delta}-\sigma \pi a \rho \epsilon i s$. ] 'He who is represented as one that received seed into the good ground.' " Os s ка $\rho \pi о ф о \rho e \bar{i}$ is to be referred, not to the word, but to the person in whose heart the word is sown. Thus is adumbrated the different effect of the Gospel on different hearts.
15. Toùs div日pcinous.] Euthym., Whitby, Beng., and Wakef. understand 'the men whose duty, it was to take care of the field.' But that is very harsh; neither was it customary to keep watch in fields, except when the corn was far advanced to maturity. It is, therefore, better to suppose, with Grot., that $\& \nu \tau$. кä日. $\alpha$. is meant for a description of night. Zú̧̧̧vıa. The Commentators are not agreed what is the plant here intended. It is with most probability supposed to be the darnel; or lolium temulentum of Linnæus, which grows among corn, and has much resemblance to wheat, but is of a deleterious quality, both the corn and the straw; and therefore deserves the opithet infelix, given by Virgil.
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28．Tà Yǔávia．］The Art．is not found in many good MSS．，the Edit．Princ．，and some Versions and Fathers，and is marked for omission or cancelled by almost all the Editors from Wets． to Fritz．It is also objected to by Middlet．on the score of grammatical propriety．And al－ though that would not of itself be sufficient to authorize its rejection，it must determine in a doubtful case．इu入lé $\xi_{\infty j e v . ~ T h e ~ w o r d ~ h a s ~ h e r e ~}^{\text {a }}$ a sigmifcatio pragnans，i．e．to root up and collect．
30．Tw．］This is not found in many MSS．and the Edit．Princ．and Erasm．，the two first of Sreph．，and other early Editions，with the Syr． vers．and Epiphanius，and is cancelled by Wets．， Matth．，Griesb．，Knapp．，and Vater．Middlet． and Frits．，however，disapprove of the omission， though on different grounds，and each dwelling pertaps too much on Grammatical niceties，to which the Secred writers were little attentive．
32．$\delta$ цикро́repov．］This the Commentators say，is for mexpóratov，as just after $\mu$ eitcov is for
 and probably derived from Hebraism．Fritz．， however，remarks that this principle has been of late exploded．The phrase was proverbial with the Jews to denote a very small thing．$\Delta$ évopov， ass it were a tree．＇Kavaoкnyoüy，neatle；ether for abelter by day，or sleep by might．
33．$\left.\zeta^{6} \mu \mathrm{y}\right]$ i．e．leaven，or sour dough，which asimilates to its own nature the dough with which it is mixed．Thus is represented the na－
ture of the influence of the Gospel on the minds of men，as in the preceding parable is shadowed forth the wide propagation of the Gospel from the very smallest beginnings．＇Evékpu孔ev． Griesb．edits ếкричеи，from several MSS．But the compound，which also occurs at Lu．xiii．21．， is far more appropriate than the simple；and the scribes were accustomed to change com－ pounds into simples．

34． x co $\rho$ is $\pi а \rho a \beta o \lambda \overline{\mathrm{~s}}, \& \mathrm{\& c}$ ．］This is by some restricted to that time，and the audience then with him．By others it is，with more probability， regarded as importing in a general way that our Lord employed many parables．
 but not exactly agreeing either with the Hebrew or Greek．Though dpeígoual might then be in the text of the Sept．；and $\phi \theta \dot{\theta} \gamma \xi^{\prime \prime \mu}$, a，the pre－ sent reading may be a gloss．Epéryeroat is properly used of the gushing forth of fluids，but metaphorically，of free and earnest speech．The words in question are admitted to be not quoted by the Evangelist as a prophecy，but to be ac－ commodated to Christ．＇A $\pi d$ к кaraßo入 $\overline{\mathrm{s}}$ ．The term is properly used of the founding of buildings， but applied occasionally by the Classical writers to the beginning of any thing．It was especially used of the world，because，according to the common notion in antient times，the world was thought to be an immense plain surface resting on foundations．
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36. tiv olxiav] i. e. the house he had left, at Capernaum.
38. Td $\delta \dot{d e} \kappa a \lambda d \nu \sigma \pi e ́ p \mu a, \& c$.] ‘ as to the good seed.' Oïrot is accommodated in construction to viol, though referring to $\sigma \pi$ ip $\mu$. Perhaps, however, $\sigma \pi \epsilon \in \rho \mu a$ is considered as a noun of multitude.
40. кaieral.] Such is the reading of almost all the MSS. and the Edit. Princ. and other early Editions; and this is adopted by almost every Editor from Wets. downward. The common reading катакаietas was probably derived
 alōvos. This is by some interpreted of the end of the age, i.e. of the Jewish polity and state. But though that sense of the phrase has place elsewhere, the context must here limit it to the final consummation of things; though the other sense may be included.
 bling block, either paturally or metaphorically, i. e. whatever occasions any one to err in his principles or practice. Hers, however, as it is joined with tois mocouvtas, it must denote not things, but persons, i. e. false teachers, such as are censured by Peter and Jude, who, under the semblance of Christian liberty, inculcated doctrines repugnant to moral virtue, and held vice to be among the d did $\phi$ opa, things indifferent. Ba入oū̃tע- Tvpós. An allusion to the Oriantal custom of burning alive, mentioned is Dan. iiii. 10. The expression is equivalent to réevva toï mupós, Matth. v. 22.
 to have had in mind Dan. xii. 3. Comp. Wisd. iii. 7. Eccles. ix. 11. 1 Macc. ii. 62. 1 Pet. v. 4. (Mackn.)
44. өпбаирй кекри $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} ข \varphi]$ і. е. such valuables as, in the insecurity of society in anient times, men were accustomed to bury in the earth, on the expectation of invasion from an enemy. This is illustrated by the citations of Wets. Frome the present passage, and one cited by Weta. from the Mischna, it appears that the Jewish law adjudged all treasure found on land to be the right of him who had bought the land. 'Expule, i. e. either ' covers it up (again),' or, conceals (his good fortune). Middlet. would, from pome MSS., cancel the Art. at $T \bar{\varphi} \boldsymbol{d} \gamma \boldsymbol{\rho} \varphi \overline{\text {. }}$. And indeed it is not easy to see what sense it can have. For that assigned by Fritz. is inadmiosible. It muat not, however, be cancelled on such slender authority ; and idioms, though diffeult to be accounted for, are not thereiore to be done away. 'A ypệ does not sigpify an estate, but a fold. Aüroü,' i.e. roū $\theta$ ทadupou ; though Griesb, edits aìroù,
 as those found in the Eaet, who travel about buying or exchanging jewels, pearls, or otber valuables; a custom illuatruted by the eitations in Wets. The $\alpha$ ivposimey added is agreeable to an idiom found chisfy in the earliest writers, but frequent in Hellenistic Greek, by which the substantive is treated as an adjective. Mapyap$i$ rac. With reppect to the origin of this word, it is juatly rexaarked by Bp. Marah, that as pearls
 бєע aúcóv．
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are the produce of the East，it is more reasonable to suppose that the Greeks borrowed the word from the Orientalists，than the contrary，which is the common opinion．The great value of pearls appears from what is said by Pliny．
 when sunk，and dragged to the shore，sweeps as it were the bottom．The word occurs in Ez．xxvi． 5 and 14．for the Heb．הר，and in Acschyl．，Elian， Artemid．，and other later writers．At ek mavto＇s yesous sub．riva or $\tau i$ ，not，however，ander－ thanding，with Kuin．，other things besides fish， but supplying ${ }^{2} \chi 0$ étac or $l \times \theta$ údiov．

48．$\tau \alpha \sigma \alpha \pi \rho \alpha]$ the refuse．$A$ vox sol．de h．re．See vi．17．and Note．＂Eछco has no re－ ference，as Kuin．and others suppose，to the baskets；but simply denotes throw away．

49．Ek $\mu$ érov．This is thought to be redund－ ant．But see Fritz．

52．Bıa toüto．］The Commentators regard this either as redundant，or，which is much the same thing，as a formula transitionis．But it rather seems to denote an inference from what has preceded，and may be rendered Wherefore then， since that is the case．And this ushers in an admonition to use the knowledge they have． Гранлатсús．The term properly denotes a doctor of the Jewish law，but here，a teacher of the Gos－ pel ；the name being transferred，from similarity
 Griesb．，Knapp．，and Vater，and Fritz．edit． Tis Barinela；but on rather too slight authority， and without sufficient reason．The phrase may be rendered，＇discipled into the kingdom of
heaven，＇or，＇admitted by discipleship into the Christian society．＇See xxiii．34．xxviii．19． Acts xiv．21．This is a sort of phrasis pregnans． If $\tau \bar{\eta} \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda c i a$ be the true reading，the sense will be，＇instructed for，＇＇disciplined to，＇i．e．com－ pletely acquainted with the nature and purposes of the Gospel．At каıva and тa入ata sub．$\beta$ pú－ $\mu a \tau \alpha$ and perhaps $\sigma \kappa$ cún．It is not necessary to $t 00$ much scrutinize these words，which simply denote such provisions or other necessaries as he may think suitable to the wants of his family， both what he has long laid up and what he has recently provided．

54．татрida］scil．то́入ん，i．e．Nazareth，the place where he had been brought up，and which was therefore，in a certain sense，his country．

55．outoós］The use of this pronoun here，as often in the Classical writers，implies contempt， like the Heb． $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ；and Latin iste．Toū тéntovos． The word técтcol denotes an artificer，or artisan， as opposed to a labourer ；and，according to the word accompanying it，may denote any artificer， whether in wood，stone or metal．But when it stands alone，it denotes a carpenter（as faber and שn）both in the Scriptural and almost always in the Classical writers．（Campb．）Who，more－ over，observes that there is something analogous in the use of our word smith．He might have more appositely instanced wright，which（derived from the Saxon wrighta，a workman）denotes car－ penter in the North of England．That such is the sense here intended，cannot reasonably be doubted，especially as it is supported by the con－ current testimony of ancient ecclesiastical writore．
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 ial sentiment (to which Wets. cites many parallel ones) importing that one whose endowments enable him to instruct, is no where so little held in honour as among his townsmen and immediate connexions.
58. oük dтоiŋбev-aivē̄v.] Christ did not judge it suitable to obtrude his miracles upon them, and so could not properly perform them. Considering their unbelief of his Divine mission, it is hard to say how he could have lavished away his favours on a people so unworthy of them. (Doddr.)
XIV. 1. Tij dкоウ̀ 'I $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \sigma \bar{u}]$ i. e. $\pi \in \rho l$ tov I.
2. macoiv.] This, by a use frequent in the Sept. (See Schleus. Lex. Vet. Test.) is supposed to denote friends. But it rather signifies ministers, officers (namely of his Court.) Al ס̀vá $\mu \mathrm{Ets}$ dעep ${ }^{2}$ è a. To account for the Art. here, Middlet. would render 'the powers, or spirits, are active in him.' But the proofs he adduces are rather specious than solid; and there geems to be no reason to abandon the common interpretation of ঠ̀váuecs, miracles. And évepy. may be taken, as usually, for dvepycïOat, 'miracles are effected by him.' But it is better, with Beza, E. V., Wakef., Schleusn., and Fritz., to take dyvdjets of the power of working miracles, as in Acts vi. 8. x. 38., by which the Art. may very well be accounted for. Thus Fritz. renders 'et propterea vires quibus funt miracula, quarum videmus efficacitatem vim in eo exercent.'

3-13. In this Episodical digression recounting the imprisonment and death of John the Baptist, the Aorists must be rendered as Pluperfects.
4. exterv] for yapeiv. A use frequent in the Classical writers, like that of habere in Latin, of which many examples are adduced by Wets.
6. yevecicov a'jumévon.] The Commentators are not agreed whether this should be understood of the birthday festival of Herod, or that in commemoration of his accession. That the latter was observed as such, is certain from Joseph. Ant. xv. 11, 3. (of Herod) and 1 Kings i. $8 \& 9$. ix. 18. Hos. vii. 5. As, however, no examples of this sense of the word yevécta have been adduced, the common interpretation is the safer ; and that the antients, both Jews and Gentiles; kept their birthdays as days of great rejoicing, is certain from a variety of passages cited by Wets. At $\gamma \in \nu \in \sigma i=\nu \nu$ some supply $\sigma v \mu \pi \sigma \sigma i \omega \nu$; others, $\dot{\eta} \mu$ ер $\bar{\omega} y$. The latter is preferable, as in the phrase
 Yet when the neuter noun, singular or plural, is employed, we may supply $\partial \dot{\mu} \mu \tau \pi$, or $\sigma \cup \mu \pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma a ;$ or rather $\gamma \in \nu$ éaliov is then a noun, as often in Herodo. and other authors cited or referred to in Recens. Synop.
 and Kuin., here understand a pantomimic and lascivious dance, recently introduced into Judea, and such as is censured by Juven. Sat. vi. 63 . and Hor. Od.iii. 6, 21. Yet that Herod should have permitted, and even been gratified with a lascivious dance by his daughter-in-law, would argue incredible indecorum and depravity. It is therefore better, with Lightf., Michaelis, and Fritz. to suppose that the dance was a decorous one, expressive of rejoicing, but from the extreme elegance with which it was performed, attracted admiration.
8. т $\rho \circ \beta \iota \beta a \sigma \theta \varepsilon i ̄ \sigma \alpha]$ adducta, urged, instigated. A signification occurring in the Sept. and also Xen. Mem. i. 2, 17. тровıß. 入о́үч. Пі́уакь, а broad and flat dish, or plate; not a basin, as Campb. renders; for from its origin (namely xiyos, a board) the word commonly denotes what is fat, or nearly so.
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 preted＇was angry；＇of which sense they adduce examples from the Classical and Scriptural wri－ ters．But some of them are exceptionable；and bere there seems no reason to deviate from the usual signification of the word．Though it might be rendered＇he was chagrined．＇The feeling was doubtless a mixed one；sorrow（on his own account chiefly）and chagrin，not without anger at being thus taken advantage of；for he could not but feel apprehensive of the consequences of $s 0$ unpopular an action．Dta toùs öpkous，i．e． ＇scrupling to break his oath before his guests； for at entertainments there was a delicacy even in rofosing requests．

10．тíм $\psi a t]$ scil．Tiva．That this is not a Hebraims，（as Rosenm．says）is plain from two examples from Plut．and Herodian adduced in Recens．Syrop．

13．dixougas．］Namely，of John＇s death，and Herod＇s opinion of himself．On both which ac－ counts，as also to avoid the imputation of blame for any disturbances which might be expected to follow such an enormity，and likewise（as we learn from Mark）to refreeh himself and his Apostles after their fatigue，our Lord sought retirement．$\Pi$ ¢ $\zeta \bar{j}$ ．Not＇on foot，＇but＇by land，＇ $\approx$ opposed to dy $\pi$ गतotw．This signification is frequent in the Classical writers，and sometimes place where there is no opposition expressed or even implied．
14．aíroîs．］On this reading all the Editors
are agreed．The common one aúrous is proved to have been a mere typographical error of Stephens＇s third Edition，faithfully retained by succeeding Editors，though to the violation of the norma loquendi．
15．$\delta \psi i a s ~ \gamma e \nu o u e ́ v \eta s] ~ i . ~ e . ~ t h e ~ f i r s t ~ e v e n i n g, ~$ which commenced at three o＇clock．That men－ tioned further on at ver．23．is the second evening， which commenced at sunset．，＇H wipa ${ }^{\prime \prime} \delta \bar{\eta}$ $\pi a \rho \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \in \nu$, ＇the day is far spent．＇＂（2）$\Omega_{\rho a}$ ，like the Latin hora，has often this sense．So at Lu．ix．
 stands it of the proper time for healing and in－ structiog the people．

19．［Kat．］This is rejected or cancelled Dy almost all Editors，as not found in the greater part of the MSS．and the Edit．Princ．and other early Editions and Fathers．It is one of the many ill－judged alterations in Stephens＇s third Edition from Erasmus＇s fifth．Eù入órøテe．Sub． т $\boldsymbol{\tau} \nu \theta \epsilon \delta \nu$ ．The word is elsewhere interchanged with eúxafı $\sigma \tau \epsilon i v$, as synonymous．See Matth． xv．36．Mark viii．6．Luke i．64．ii．28．xxiv． 53. Joh．vi．11．\＆23．Acts xxviii．35．Jam．iii． 5. When the name of food，or sacrifice，is expressed，
 $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \theta v \sigma\{a \nu$ ．K $\lambda$ áбas．The Jewish loaves were in fact cakes，broad，thin，and brittle，like our biscuits；and therefore required to be broken rather than cut，and thus would leave very many fragments ；which accounts for the great quantity thereof gathered up．






















20. ijpav] scil. of dxdorodoc. And at to терเббeйov sub. $\mu$ ípos. K $\lambda \alpha \sigma \mu d \tau \omega \nu$, i. e. not only the fragments which would arise from breaking up loaves for so great a multitude, but (as appears from John vi.. 13.) those also which each person would make in eating. The words following dasick $\alpha-\pi \lambda$ rifects are in apposition and exegetical of the preceding. g. d. namely, twelve baskets full. Koфivous. This word has occasioned more discussion among the Commentators than might have been imagined; especially from these cophini being in Juven. Sat. iii. 14. and vi. 512. connected with hay, which has been a mote in the eyes of the Commentators. The most rational and natural opinion is, that the baskets in question were either (as Buxt. thinks) such as had, from the earliest period, been a part of the household utensils of the Jews. (See Deut. xxviii. 5.) or (as Reland, Schleus., and Kuin. suppose) were portable flag-baskets, such as were commonly used by the Jews in travelling through Heathen countries, to convey their provisions, in order to ayoid the pollution of unclean food. The hay, it is supposed, they took with them, to make a bed. Yet these baskets could not have held any quantity sufficient for that purpose. It is more probable that the cophini here meant carried no hay; and those mentioned by Juvenal, were of a much larger sort, used for packing up various articles of pedlary, such as the foreign Jews even then used to deal in.
22. गүáyкaбey] From this term many have mferred the unwillingness of the disciples to de-
part, influenced by ambitious views, as thinking that, from the multitude being so urgent for making Jesusa King, now would be the time to set up his earthly kingdom. The verb, however, like others in Greek and Latin of similar import. is often used of moral persuasion; as Thucyd. viii. 41. and vii. 37. Nay, by an idiom frequent in our own language, it may only mean 'he made,' i. e. caused them, ' to enter,' \&c.
24. $\mu \dot{\text { ö́cov }}$ ] Sub. xard ; unless it be, as Fritr. says, a Nomin. Baravi\}óuevov simply signifies 'violently tossed;' as in Polyb. i. 48. 2. a stormy wind is said rúpyous $\beta$ acavi'\}elv.
 proverbial mode of expressing impossibility. So Horapollo Hierogi. i. 58. says, that the Egyptina hieroglyphic for impossibility was a man's feat walking on the sea. Thus our Saviour evinced his divine power; for this is in Job ix. 8. made a property of the Deity; $\dot{\text { d }}$ тavíaas Tdy oupaydy.

27. dyos elpt] 'it is I.' Literally, I am the person! A somewhat rare idiom.
28. xèevoov, \&cc.] Under bid is also implied enable me to, \&c. ; for Peter wished a miracle to be worked, to prove that it was really Jesus.
31. ddtãacas] The word properly signifies to stand in bivio, undetermined which way to
 túxows láv dodoús. 'Exónacev, was lulled, or hushed. Sub. बciurdy. Examples are adduced by the Commentators from Herodo. vii. 191 ; and友lian ap..Suid.
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33. Oeoù ufos aI. Bishop Middlet. has proved that the want of the Art, will not authorize us to trasshate 'a son of God,' or 'son of a God.' For, as to the former in the sense prophet, there is no proof that prophets were so called. And as to the latter, which is thought suitable to the ideas of Pagans, there is no proof that these men were such; or, if so, they might adopt the language of the Apostles on this extraordinary occasion : and though it is urged that the disciples were not yet acquainted with the divinity of our Lord, yet that must be received with some limitation : that the Messiah would be the son of God, was a Jewisp doctrine; and therefore if they acknowledged him as the Christ, they must have regarded him as the son of God; a title which they had repeatedly heard him claim to himself. And what they themselves held, they could scarcely but inpart to the Pagan mariners, whose exclamation may thus be understood in the highest sense. ${ }^{-1 \lambda}$ really the character which, thou claimest and art said to be, the son of God.'
XV. 1. oi $\alpha \pi d^{\prime}$ 'Ieporo $\left.\lambda u ́ \mu c o \nu\right]$ ] Those of,' or belonging to 'Jerusalem.' An idiom occurring in numerous passages of the Scriptural and Closvesical writers referred to by the Commentators.Those of Jerusalem were the learned of the Phorisaical sect, and as such entitled to deliver instriction wherever they went. They were probaby sent by the chief of the Pharisees, and came doubtless with insidious intentions.
 ed. signifies a precept, or body of precepts, not written, but handed down by tradition. So



 meant, not the members of the Sanhedrin, but the most celebrated doctors.

them from their own positions, ably opposing the mapaioogts, \&cc. to the duto入خ fou $\theta e o u$; and before he disputes respecting the tradition to which they referred, he uproots the very foundation on which their whole reasoning was erected, and shows by a manifest example how often this radition is at variance with the Divine Laws.
4. Tina $\tau \delta \nu \pi a \pi f \rho a]$ This was understood to comprehend under obedience and dutiful respect, taking care of and supporting. See Numb. xxii. 17. xxiv. 1. Jug. xiii. 17. So Eccles. iii. 8.
 кaкo入ojeiv, ללp, comprehended neglecting to support. Such, too, was the mode of interpretsion sanctioned by their own Canonists. See Lights. and Wets. Lou after Ta $\alpha \tilde{j}^{\prime} \rho a$ is cancelled or rejected by all the best Editors, as being of little or no authority, and one of the false readings of Erasm. received by Staph. into his third Edition. Өavdre is not a mere pleonasm, but a strong expression, importing a capital punishment of the worst sort. Or $\theta a \nu$. te. may mean, ' let him be put to death without mercy,' Hebrew Mem mit to which our common phrases bear a little affinity.
 to kop kay in Mark vii. 11., properly signified something devoted to the service of God. But, as it was often introduced in making a vow against using any article, it came, at length, to denote any thing prohibited ; and if spoken with reference to any particular person, the phrase imported, that the vower obliged himself not to give any thing to the person in question; and thus, if that person was the father of the vower, he was held prohibited from relieving his necessities. Such is the view taken of the term by Lights., Grot., Camp., Kin., and most recent Commentators. Yet it is more natural, with the antient Fathers and some modern Commentators, to take $\delta$ coupon simply of something consecrated, or supposed to be consecrated, to pious uses, by a
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collusion between the sons and the priests, so as to leave the father destitate.
-кal oi $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \boldsymbol{\eta}, \& \mathrm{c}$.] Euthym., not without reason, complains of the difficulty of the construction, in which some suppose an apodosis to be wanting, suppressed per aposiopesin, either
 Others suppose an ellipsis of some word, as $\delta \phi \in \lambda_{e}$, or $\kappa \kappa \omega \lambda \cup \tau \delta \nu$. Kuin. and others regard the kal as a mere expletive, (as often the Heb. 1 ) and render 'he need not honour.' But this removing of a difficulty by silencing a word is too violent. And as to the other methods abovementioned, there is certainly no aposiopesis, nor any ellipsis properly so called, but merely, as Fritz. suggests, an apodosis is to be supplied from the former verse, q. d. बayáve $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ т $\epsilon$ -入еитárш.
7. калсіs троєфทंтеvбe, \&cc.] Some Commentators regard this as really a prediction, veiled under a rebuke to the people immediately addressed. Most, however, account it an accommodation of the words of the Prophet, to the Jews of the age of Christ; or take it to mean, that the Prophet well said of the hypocrites of his age what was true of hypocrites in every age. The sense should seem to be, 'the words pronounced by Isaiah are extremely applicable as said of you.' Проєф., declared, uttered.
8. ${ }^{\text {dr }}$ [ [Sct-кal] These words omitted in four or five MSS., and some Versions and Fathers, are cancelled by Griesb. But the evidence in question will scarcely warrant suspicion.
9. ठidarka入ias ' as, or by way of, command-

 is here and at Mark ix. 7. and Col. ii. 2. contrasted by implication with the commands of God, which are in the New Testament called,

10. ovyicce] 'mind, endeavour to understand.'
 Lord did not hereby intend to abrogate the distinction between clean and anclean things for food. His meaning was that nothing was naturally and per se impure (and therefore such as could defile the mind of man), but only so ex instituto. Or his words may be understood comparatè; $q$. d. forbidden meats do not pollute so much as impure thoughts and intentions. Middlet. observes that the Art. at $\tau \delta \nu \dot{d} \nu \theta \rho$ ponov is necessary, because, as in the case of regimen, the definiteness of a part supposes the definiteness or the whole.
12. $\left.\tau d \nu \lambda \delta \gamma_{0} \nu\right]$ i. e. what Jesus had just said concerning their traditions.
13. фuтeía] The word properly signifies 'a planting,' or plant; but metaphorically denotes the doctrines or traditions in question, by an allusion to the mind as soil, and precepts as plants. See Matth. xiii. 29 and 38. 1 Cor. iii. 6. A comparison familiar both to the Hebrews and Greeks. See Wets.
14. हैंфєтє aüroüs] 'heed them not, nor their
 proverbial saying, common to both the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans. Bóbuvoy signifies, not ditch, but pit, such as were dug for the reception of rain water. Meqoüvtaı, 'will fall.' To be understood of what is customary.
15. Ta $\rho a \beta \circ \lambda \eta_{\nu} \nu$ ' the maxim, or weighty apothegm. It is not that Peter did not understand the maxim (which was by no means obscure, insomuch that our Lord says kal íseis aंनúveroi dंбre;) but his prejudices darkened his understanding, and he could scarcely believe his ears, that a distinction of meats availed not, and therefore asks an explanation.
16. $\dot{d}^{\prime} \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$ ] Put adverbially for ${ }^{\prime} \tau \tau$, as not unfrequently in the Classical writers.
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17. dфedpēva] A word of the Macedonian dialect. From its etymon (d $d \pi d$ and 'Ço $\alpha \alpha$.) it signifies a place apart, a pripy.
21. els $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\rho} \rho \eta$ ] As Christ seems not to have actually entered into the Gentile territories, we must here (with Grot.) interpret els versus, toerards, (with the Syriac.) So the Hebrew 7 local, like our ward in tovard. Mark, indeed,
 of dabions signification, and denoted a strip of land which was between two counties, and properly belonging to neither. So it is explaned by the Gloss. Vet. interfines. Indeed $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\boldsymbol{f}} \mathrm{to} \mathrm{\nu}$ frequently signifies, not border, but country, or territory.
22. ruvi Xavavaia] Called by Mark 'E $\mathrm{E} \lambda \eta$ ois Evpoфoivicбa, i. e. a Gentile dwelling on the confines of Phoenicia. She was therefore a Gentile by birth, and not a proselyte, as some have supposed. Yet it does not follow that she was an idolatress; for many Gentiles in those parts were believers in one true God, and felt much respect for Judaism, though they did not profens it. She might easily, therefore, have learns the doctrine of a Messiah, and the appellation, from the Jews.
 'asked, besought him.' An usage confined to the New Testament and Sept. 'AróAvoov, i. e. 'dispatch her business;' for it implies, 'with the grant of the favour she asks,' as appears from ver. 24 and 26.
26. кuvapiors The word was adopted after the manner of the Jews in speaking of the Gentiles, though it was also a term of reproach in common use with both.
27. val kupic] The Commentators are not agreed as to the force of this formula. Most modern ones (after Scalig. and Casaub.) assign to it the sense 'obsecro te,' as in Philem. xxii. Rev. xxii. 20, and sometimes in the Classical writers. And so the Heb. א3. The antients, and some moderns, as Grot., Le Clerc., Elsn., E. V., Schleus,, and others, take it to import assent, which, indeed, is most agreeable to the answer. And though $\alpha \lambda \lambda a$ does not follow, as it properly should, yet, in such pathetic sentences, regularity is forgotten. Here (as often) $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ has reference to a short clause omitted, to be thus supplied: 'True, Lord, (but extend a small portion of thy help and mercy towaris me;) for even (кal) the dogs, \&c.
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30. $\kappa v \lambda \lambda o u s$ ] It is by no means clear what is meant by this term, and how it differs from $x$ $\infty \lambda$ ous. See Recens. Syn. I have there oonjectured that кú入入os (which Hesych. explains by кd $\mu \pi \nu \lambda o s$ ) meant one with a distorted limb, as a foot; exactly answering to our expressions bow-leg, and bow-legged. Such persons are not, in a proper sense, lame; yet they sometimes labour under more inconveniences than would be occasioned by the loss of a limb. And therefore we need not wonder that such should offer themselves as ob. jects of our Lord's mercy; and surely the cure of such a radical misformation must give an exalted idea of our Lord's power.
31. кnoovov] i. e. deaf and dumb; since those born deaf are naturally dumb also.
32. ग̀цépat tpeis $]$ The reading here is dubious. Most of the antient MSS., and some Fathers have r̀ $\mu$ épat, which has been reoeived by almost all Editors from Wets. downward ; and justly, since the common reading $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathcal{S}^{\prime} \rho a s$ plainly arose from an alteration of this more difficult reading. Yet this leaves a construction of unprecedented harshness, which Fritz. would remove by inserting, from a few MSS., Versions, and Fathers, elouv, kal. The authority however, is so slight, and the words so evidently from the margin, that I cannot venture to follow the example. It is strange none should have seen that the difficulty may better be removed by simply altering the accent of apoapéyovat to троб $\mu \in \nu 0 \bar{v} \sigma$, thus taking it for a particip. Dat.
plur. Thus the ellipse of eloc will be very regu. lar, and the construction usual, i. e. there are three days to them staying with me; i. e. they have stayed with me three days. The words following, кal oùk éx Xovoı \&cc., signify ' and now they have nothing (left) to eat.'
39. évé $\beta \eta$ ] Almost all the Editors from Wets. to Fritz. adopt or prefer $\alpha \nu e ́ \beta \eta$, from several MSS. Versions, and Fathers, with the Edit. Princ. and the two first of Steph. And this may possibly be the true reading. But as I cannot remember any instance of that word being used of embarking. (whereas $\dot{d} \mu$ ßaive is often so used both in the New Testament and Sept.) I have scrupled to receive it. Though some may on that very ground maintain its authenticity, and account it Hellenistic ; indeed it comes from a quarter which usually brings the truth.
XVI. 1. ${ }^{\text {en }} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\eta} \omega^{\prime} \tau \eta \sigma a \nu$ ] The same idiom as that by which we say, ask (i. e. request) any person to do a thing. On the thing itself see supra. xii. 34 .
2. eùifa] Sub. écias. The Jews, as indeed the antients in general, were attentive observers of all prognostics of weather, fair or foul $;$ and many similar sayings are adduced from both the Rabbinical and Classical writers by the Commentators.
3. $\sigma$ тvyva'\} $\omega \nu$ ] for кal orvyváYec. The Commentators and Lexicographers say that orvyudYeav signifies properly to grieve, and thence to be gloomy. The very reverse, however, is the truth.
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The verb (which is rarely met with except in the New Testament and Sept.) is derived from orviyos, thick, from orevew, to stuff up. Td $\mu$ dy zporworrov \&cc. "From this reproof (says Mackn.) it appears, that the refusal of the Jews to acknowledge the Messiahship of Christ, was owing neither to the want of evidence, nor to the want of capacity to judge of that evidence. The accomplishment of the ancient prophecies (Gen. rlix. 10. Is. xi. 1; Xxxv. 5. Deut. ix. 24.) and the miracles which he performed, were proof sufficient, and much more easily discernible than the signs of the seasons."
 phrase signifying studiously attend to. It is not 90 much a Hebraism as an idiom common to the simple and colloquial style in all languages. Zúmps, i. e. their doctrines, as $\delta$ obaxy imports both doctrines and ordinances. See Lightf.
7. $\lambda$ éyovres" ötc] Sub. eife or the like. See Grot. and Glass.
13. Tíva цe 入éүovaı \&cc.] Bp. Middleton has bere ably shown the correctuess of the common construction and rendering of the passage'Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am.' The interpretation of Beza and others, which
supposes a double interrogation, would involve an intolerable harshness, not to say solecism. Yet he thinks the conjecture of Adler probable, that the received reading was made up of two,
 is the reading of Mark and Luke) and of riva גéरovary ol ä̀ Ofwixou, which is the supposed true reading of St. Matthew. The $\mu \varepsilon$ is cancelled by Fritz. almost entirely on the authority of Yersions and Fathers. But as it is omitted only in one MS., its authenticity cannot well be questioned.
16. $\dot{\delta}$ ulds- $\zeta \overline{\tilde{\omega}} \nu \tau 0 s$ ] Whitby supposes there was this difference between $\dot{o} \mathbf{X}$ pıords and $\dot{\delta}$ vids тoū $\theta \epsilon \bar{v}$, that the former referred to his office, the latter to his divine original ; though he admits that neither Nathaniel (John i. 50.) nor the other Jews, nor even the Apostles, used it in that sublime sense in which Christians always take it. Zйuros, i. e. (as Rosenm. and Kuin. explain) the (only) living and true God, as distinguished from dumb idols (eiden $1 a(\psi u x a$, Sap. xiv. 29.), fictitious deities, called $\nu$ eк $\rho o l$. 'Ps. cvi. 28, and other places.
17. $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \xi \kappa \kappa a l a i \mu \alpha]$ i.e. according to the senso of the expression in the New Testament and
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Rabbinical writers, man. It is remarkable that it should not occur in the Sept.
18. $\Sigma i ̀$ ei Hétpos] Cephas in Syriac. This was not an original appellation, but given at his conversion. See Joh. i. 42. It was customary for the Jewish Doctors to bestow new names on their disciples, chiefly, we may suppose, with reference to some peculiar disposition or quality. So, in the present instance, Rock intimates the firmness which prompted Peter to avow his faith in Jesus; a sample of the intrepid zeal afterwards evinced in building up the Church, and establishing the Religion of Christ. Examples of a simiar paronomasia I have adduced in Recens. Sya.
 Commentators understand by $\pi$ érpa the confession or profession of faith just made by Peter. Other antient and modern ones suppose that our Lord then pointed to himself as the great foundation. But the latter is exceedingly harsh, and involves a wholly gratuitous supposition: and the former, though entitled to more attention, from the great names in support of it, is scarcely admissible, being repugnant to the context. For to take xét $\rho$ a to mean this confession, as on a rock, is surely harsh. And when the Apostle is thus represented as a жétpos, not the жét $a$ of the Church, there is destroyed whatever can be thought remarkable, or meant as the reward of St. Peter's singular confession. Besides, the words following кal $\delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \omega \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma$, evidently allude to some other gift or distinction. There can, therefore, be little hesitation in preferring the interpretation which refers the mézpa to Peter personally. And this has been fully established by Euthym., Grot., Le Clerc, Alberti, Cameron, Hammond, Whitby, Clarke, L'Enfant, Beausobre, Palairet, Pfaffius, Beng., Doddr., Newcome, Michaelis, Marsh, Middleton, Maltby, Kuin., Fritz., Schleus., \&c. The sense has been well expressed thus: 'Thou art by name rock, and suitable to that name shall be thy work and office; for upon thee, (upon thy preaching, as upon a rock, shall the foundation of my Church be laid.' The force of the paronomasia in $\Pi$ éroos is lost in our language, but expressed in the Greek, Italian, and French. As to the arguments of those who maintain that $\pi$ ét $\rho a$ aiguifies the conf:ssion of Peter, deduced from the relative signification of $\pi$ ét $\rho o s$ and $\pi \dot{e} \tau \rho a$, they are too insignificant to deserve any serious attention; indeed, the question has long ago been disposed off by Alberti and Palairet.

- $\pi \dot{\prime} \lambda a t \ddot{\ddot{q}} \dot{\delta} o u-a \dot{u} \tau \bar{\eta} s]$ If the interpretation above recommended of a $\dot{\epsilon} \rho a$ be well founded, aù $\bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}$, here cannot but refer to è $\kappa \kappa \lambda \eta \sigma$ iav. And so it is almost universally taken; though a few refer it to $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \rho a$, , either with reference to the $c m$ fession, or to Peter personally. See Recens Synop. The former mode of interpretation unquestionably deserves the preference. By $\dot{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda \eta-}$
$\sigma l a \nu$ is to be understood, not the Church properly so called, (which is liable to objection) but (as the best Commentators are agreed) the individual members of which the Church, as a body of the faithful, is composed. It is therefore meant, that not even death itself shall prevail over the faithful members of Christ's Church, but that they shall enjoy resurrection unto life and felicity. The phrase wü入al ạ̈ov is interpreted by all the best modern Comimentators, the state of the dead, or of death; i. e. death. It occurs both in the Hebrew and Greek writers frequently ; (See the examples adduced by Wets and others) and always in the sense, the approach to the place of departed souls, the state of the dead.
 continuation of the image by which the Church is compared to an edifice founded on a rock. They seem intended to further explain what is meant by founding the Church upon Peter, as a foundation; and they figuratively denote, that Peter should be the person by whose instrumentality the kingdom of heaven, the Gospel Dispensation, should be opened, once for all, to both Jews and Gentiles; which was verified by the event. See Acts ii. 41. x. 44. compared with ,xv. 7. Moreover, the expression "the keys"" may also refer to the power and authority for the said work; especially as a key or keys was antiently a common symbol of authority; and presenting with a key was a form of investing with authority, and such was afterwards worn as a badge of office. See Is. xxii. 22.
 of the former. Yet it should seem that the image taken from the keys is not contained in these words, but that they are a fuller developement of the trust and power of which keys constitute a symbol. Even here, however, considerable diversity of interpretation exists; though there is little doubt but that the view taken by Lightf., Selden, Hamm., Whitby, and most recent Commentators, is the true one. $\Delta$ setv signifies to forbid, not only in the Rabbinical writings perpetually, but also in Dan. vi. 8. ix. 11. 16.; as also in the Chaldee Paraphrase on Numb. xi. 28. And $\lambda \dot{e}$ eıv (Heb. שרח and denotes to pronounce lauful, concede, permit, direct, consticute, \&c. The sense, therefore, is: ' Whatsoever thou shalt forbid, or whatever declare lawful, and constitute in the Church, shall be ratified, and hold good with God;' including all the measures necessary for the establishment and regulation of the Church. The Student will observe that this sense of the words déect and $\lambda$ úect is directly contrary to that which prevails among the Classical writers, in which $\lambda \dot{v}$ él ( $\nu \dot{\nu} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$ ) is synonymous with кaтa入vét (עópov), to abrogate \&cc. but no where, perhaps, in the sense concede, per-
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oùdeis òvéaral $\lambda$ úaat (cited by Seld.) But even that is the literal Greek version of an Oriental inceription, and therefore is likely to follow the Eastern idiom. The phrase défıv עó $\mu$ ov has never been produced. I have, however, met with a paseage which approaches to it in Soph. Antig.
 Өeímy тגiov; where the Schol. thus interprets,
 clear that the powers thus conferred on St. Peter (which, however, were soon after bestowed on all the Apostles, see Matt. xviii. 18., in such a manner as to give no œcumenical superiority one over another) will by no means justify the assertion of any peculiar prerogative to the Roman Pontiff, nor affect the question at issue between Protestants and Romanists upon the power of the Church. Whatever foundation Peter might be to the Church, it is clear that the image excludes all notion of a succession of persons similarly circumstanced. Nor, if the superiority of St. Peter had been permanent, could it afford a shadow of reason for deducing from it the supremacy of St. Peter in the persons of his successors.
20. 'Inoous]. The most eminent Critics are agreed that this is to be cancelled, on the authority of fifty-four MSS. and several Versions and Fathers.
21. On the connexion of the remaining portion of the Chapter, see Mackn. and Porteus. MperBurípuy, i. e. the members of the great Sanhedrim. See xxvi. 3. Acts iv. 8. \& xxv. 15. where they are called $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta u \tau \dot{f} \rho เ o \nu$. Luke $x x i i .66$.
22. троблаво́неvos aن்т $\nu$ ] This controverted expression is best interpreted 'taking him by the hand;' an action naturally accompanying advice, remonstrance, or censure. Schleus. adduces an example of this sense from. Plutarch, to which may be added another in Aristoph. Lysist. 1128,

rucíc here only denotes affectionate chiding.
 "God forbid," and common in the Old Testament, Philo, and Josephus. The words follow-
 some measure exegetical of the preceding.
23. इaтavā] The word here signifies an adversary, or evil counsellor. Ekáy $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$ o ${ }^{2}$ \&c. is exegetical of the preceding, and signifies, 'thou art an obstacle to the great work of atonement by my death;' namely, by fostering that horror of his painful and ignominious death, which occasionally harassed our Saviour. Ȯ̀ фроעeis. $\Phi$ Poveiv $\tau i$ tivos signifies to be well affected to any one, to take his side. Here it denotes caring for, being devoted to, as 1 Macc. x. 20. фроveì $\tau \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$.
24. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho \nu \eta \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta \omega$ éaut $\dot{\nu} \nu$ ] 'let him neglect his preservation, not value his life.' SeeActs xxii. 26 . Lu. xiv. 26.
 seems to be a proverbial expression, transferred by Jesus from temporal to spiritual application; q. d. 'If we think an earthly and temporary life cheaply bought, at whatever price, how much more a heavenly and eternal one.' At Y $\eta \mu \omega \omega 0$ 万̀ sub. els, which is sometimes expressed in the Classical writers, though they generally use the Dative. Ti $\delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma e c \& c$. Another proverbial expression, with which Wets. compares several others.
27. $\mu e \lambda \lambda_{\epsilon t}$ yàp \&ce.] The Commentators are not agreed whether this and the verse following should be taken of the first advent of Christ, at the destruction of the Jewish state and nation, or of the final advent, at the day of judgment. The former mode of interpretation is adopted by the most eminent Commentators, on account of the verse following. But others, perhaps more correctly, refer them to the two jadgments respectively.
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 thers have icroitcov, which is edited by Matth., Griesb., Knapp., and Vater. Others have $\dot{e} \sigma \tau \bar{\omega} \tau \rho s$, which is adopted by Wets., and edited by Fritz., as being the more difficult reading. But it seems to have come from the margin, and to have been a conjecture of those who proposed to read ciol raves ciode éorwires. As to the first mentioned reading, it may be the true one; but the evidence is not so strong as to demand any change, and the common reading is defended by Markix. 1. and Luke ix. 27. Feúєofat $\begin{gathered}\text { ayátov }\end{gathered}$ is a Hebraism (like $\theta e w p e i ̃ ~ \theta a y ., ~ J o h . ~ v i i i . ~ 51 ., ~$ Ideiv $\theta a \nu .$, Luke ii. 26.) by which verbs of sense are used in the metaphorical signification to experience, not unfrequent in the Classical writers, joined not, indeed, with $\theta a y \dot{r} r o v$, but with nouns denoting trouble. And this extends even to some modern languages.
XVII. 1. $\mu е \tau \epsilon \mu о \rho \phi \omega^{\prime} \theta_{\eta}$ ] The word (which sometimes imports a change of substance) here denotes only a change in external appearance, (as in Flian V.H.1. 1.) agreeably to the sense of its primitive $\mu \circ \rho \phi \dot{\eta}$ in the Old and New Testament. Thus, in the plainer words of Luke ix.29.
 This most illustrious transaction (of which the scene was probably Mount Tabor) is described by three out of the four Evangelists, and alluded to in the fourth; all agreeing on the main points. Doubtless it was meant to effect most important purposes, which we may be allowed humbly to conjecture. It was, we may suppose, especially intended to give the Apostles that sign from heaven which was regarded as the most unquestionable of all demonstration of Divine mission. As to the manner of this transaction, it is supposed to have been a figurative representation of Christ's advent to judge the world, and thereby the fulfilment of the late promise of Christ to his disciples, that some standing there should be witnesses of the glory in which he would appear at the day of judgment. And as glorification implies resurrection, so the doctrines of a general resurrection and retribution are sapposed to be represented. At all events, the representation
was doubtless meant to console the Apostles, under their present trials and tribulations, with the prospect of the glory that should be revealed. Another important purpose was, to figuratively (and by a symbolical action) denote the expiration of the Jewish and the commencement of the Christian Dispensation. Moses and Elias (as the appropriate representatives of the Law and the Prophets) are brought forward to render up their authority into the hands of Christ, to whom they had all along borne witness. And by the words "Hear ye him," and by their disappearance and leaving Jesus alone, it was represented that Moses and the Prophets had announced to Christ that the ceremonial law had ceased, and the Gospel was established. With respect to the circumstances of the transaction, three only of the disciples were taken, because that formed the number of witnesses necessary for legal proof; and the three selected were the most confidential disciples, who were afterwards to be witnesses of our Lord's agony in the garden, as they were now of his glory. There is no reason, with some sceptical foreign Theologians to suppose the whole a vision; for though the disciples had been slumbering, yet they are plainly said to have been awake when they saw Moses and Elias conversing with Jesus; both of whom would doubtless appear in proprid persond ; which involves no difficulty but such as Omnipotence will vanquish at the general resurrection. As to the nature of the change in question, it is incom: prehensible to us, with our present faculties. Much more on this subject might be said; but speculation on so awful an event should be restrained. Suffice it to add, that the present portion strongly countenances the doctrines of the world of spirits, and their existence in a state of consciousness and acquaintance with what passes on earth; on which see an interesting work by Mr. Huntingford.
4. $\sigma \kappa \eta v a s$ ] Namely, booths composed of branches of trees, such as were hastily raised for temporary purposes by travellers, and such as were reared at the feast of tabernacles. (Camp.)
5. фатteıvi] Griesb. and Fritz. edit фwtion
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on account of its being the more difficult read ing. But that Critical canon has its exceptions; and one is, when the reading involves a violation of the norma loquendi. Now veф. фoords, as Knittel and Fritz. remark, "repugnantiam guandam continet, (Comp. Mark ix. 7.) nec tacile dici potest," whereas фworenvi is supported by vi. 22. See xi. 34 \&c 36 . Another is, when the external evidence for the reading is exceedingly slight ; which is the case here; for it is found only in five or six inferior MSS. 'Bre srriage. Not, overshadowed, but suirrounded. An Hellenistic use found in the Sept. The cobrods may be understood of all present. \$covi Scc. One of the three instances in the Gospels, of God's personally interposing and bearing teatimony in favour of His Son., Austoũ is to be eaken omphatically, 'him alone,' and no longer Moses and the Prophets.
6. ÉTTє gemerally and naturally assumed by those to whom such visions were made, and to be accounted for not onfy on a principle of foar, (it being the general persuasion that the sight of a expermatural being must destroy life) but of reverence.
9. dజd тoù zoovs] For axd Matth., Griesb., Knappe, and Fritz. edit ${ }^{\alpha} \kappa$, from very many MSS., early Editions, and Fathers. But there is mo sufficient reason for alteration; especially as caraf. dits zoovs is often used in the New Testament; кacaß. iк тoü öpous never. To Soqua, what they had seen, á cioov, as Mark phrases it. Neither this term nor the drтaria of Luke will warrant the notion that it was 2 mere vision or dream.
 bere a difficulty arising from the obscurity of the comexion and the brevity of the ennnciation.

The sense is most probably as follows: ' How can the declaration of the scribes, grounded on the prophecy of Malachi, hold good, that Elias must precede the Messiah, to announce his coming, account him \&cc., when we see the Messiah first advancing in his advent, and no Elias appearing, at least to perform any of the offices in question ?'
11. 'H $\lambda i ́ a s \mu^{\prime} \nu \nu-\pi \alpha \dot{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha$ ] The sense (which has been causelessly disputed) is doubtiess as follows: "Elias is indeed first to come, and will restore all things,' i. e. be the means of introducing a mighty moral change and reformation.' The future tense is used, because Jesus here uses the language which was generally applied to the Messiah. Anoкатабтíet is said to be taken of intention rather than effect. But what John was to do, which was only to act an introductory part, was accomplished, and axoкат. must be explained with a reference thereto. There is no ground for the notion of some Commentators, that drox. here signifies, 'he shall finish and put an end to all things,' i.e. to the Jewish dispensation.
12. oúk גส $夭$ 'y Elias,' 'did not recognise him ;' there being much disagreement as to his real character. ' $\mathbf{E} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ auca. This is thought to be a Hebraism; but it is rather a popular idiom, similar to one in our own language. Moceiv is adapted to denote treatment of every kind, whether good or bad. "Ooa ${ }^{j}{ }^{2} \lambda_{\eta \eta \sigma a \nu}$ is a popular idiom (with which Markl. ap. Recens. Synop. compares one ex actly similar in Xenoph.) like our "to have one's will of any one;" which usually implies violence. See Luke xxiii. 25, and Mark ix. 13.
14. aùrdv] So all the Editors from Wets. downwards read, for aúrê, on the strongest evidence both of MSS., the Edit. Princ., and
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Fathers, and the usage of Scripture, as Mark i. 40. x. 17 .
15. శe入nud'̧erat] 'he is moonstrack,' or lunatic. From the symptoms mentioned here and at Mart ix. 18 ., this disorder is supposed to have been epilepsy, under whose paroxysms those afflicted with it are deprived of all sense bodily and mental, and nearly all articulation. And as we find, in the antient medical writers, epileptic patients described as lunatic or moonstruck, agreeably to the common notion of the infuence of the moon in producing the disorder, it is very possible that the disorder in question was epilepgy. Be that, however, as it may, the symptoms are all reconcileable with dmmoniacal influence.
17. í reved äziaros Who are the persons here meant, has been doubted. Some understand the father and the relations. Others, the Jews, i. e. the Scribes who might be present on the occasion. Others, again, the disciples; which seems from the context to be the most probable; but it is better, with Doddr., Kypke, Kuin., \&c. to suppose the reproof meant for ull present, each as they deserved it. Teved ảxiotos may be referred to the disciples, and perbaps the father; ठıeबтp. to the Scribes; the first iн $\mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ to the disciples and the second to the scribes. Diecт $\rho a \mu$ $\mu$ evos signifies literally crooked, perverse, and, metaphorically, bad, whether in body, or in mind or morals. See Recens. Synop. It may be observed that there is a similar metaphor in our word wrong, from the part. past wrung, from wringen, to twist. In both terms there is a tacit reference to what is straight. "Eos xoce. $\dot{\mu} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ long must my presence be necessary to you.'
18. кal dтетiцทбєу-daıцóvıov] Some refer
the aưrê to the sick person ; others, far more correctly, to the demon. In fact, the passage


20. шо ко́ккоу бıуа́тесоs] i. e. even in the smallest degree ; for this was a common and proverbial expression to denote any thing exceedingly small, (the oivari being the smallest of all seeds) just as to remove mountains was an adagial hyperbole to denote the accomplishment of any thing apparently impossible. See the Rabbinical citations in Wets.
21. тoùto td $\gamma$ ǵvos] Here almost all Commentators supply daruovico. But that would suppose different kinds of dæmons, which, though a possible fact, yet must not be admitted into revelation per ellipsin. The truth is, there is no such ellipsis, but, (as Chrys., Euthym., and some modern Commentators have seen,) the sense is: 'this kind of beings,' namely demons. Similar expressions might be adduced both from the Greek, Latin, and modern languages. 'B $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ тробеихй каl עทбтcia, viz. says Campb. as necessary to the attainment of that faith without which the dæmons could not be expelled, and therefore prayer and fasting might be said to be the cause, as being the cause of the cause. The conjecture here of Sykes and Bowyer iv mporex ei $\nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon!(\%$, is too absurd to deserve a moment's attention. For if that were the sense, the words of the passage would present no answer to the inquiry of the Apostles. The present verse is wanting in some MSS.; but there is no good ground for supposing it not genuine. All the MSS. have it in Mark.
 collected the didrachmas.' A collective name for the tax so called. The plur. is used with
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reference to the many persons from whom it was collected，each paying one．And the Art．has reference to the customary payment．The de－ clension of this noun is ot diopaxuov，roü \＆$\delta \rho$ dixpov．The tax was doubtless the half shekel，the sacred tribute．

25．8Te clōi入Aev els tivy olkiav］Who is here meant，is not clear．Almost all the Commenta－ cors suppose Jesus．We may，however，under－ otand it of Peter，with Euthym．，L．Brug．，and Kain．，supported by the Syr．Cod．Corb．1．The sense may be thus expressed：＇When Peter had entered into the house，（whither Jesus had already gone，while the tax－gatherers were ap－ plying to Peter for the contribution）and was just about to ask him whether he would not pay the contribation，Jesus was beforehand with his question，by asking him one，namely，Tí oot

 very rare，insomuch that it is unaccompanied by an example in Steph．Thes．It is，however，to be found in three passages of Thucyd．ricuv， i．e．thoee of their own family，as opposed to dג入ot，thoge not of their own family．
 we may not give them a handle for saying that we despise the temple，＇\＆c．or rather，lest we should make them suppose that we undervalue the temple；which might cause them to stumble
 ix $\theta \bar{y} y$ ，that which rises to or meets the hook． Or it is a Neut．for Pass．As to the piece of money here mentioned，we need not，with 8 chmidt，suppose it created on purpose，but that it had fallen into the sea，and been swal－ lowed by the fish．Many instances are on record （some adduced by Wets．）of jewels，coins \＆c． being found in the bellies of fish．

XVIII．1．iv ikeivy Tip ¿ipa］＇at that time＇ （シ̈pa for кatpds，as xi． 25 ．）and probably on the
same day with the events just recorded，namely the transfiguration，and the payment of the didrachma by our Lord for himself and Peter． Tis äpa $\mu e i \notin \omega \nu$ \＆c．This interrogation，no doubt，arose from a dispute which had arisen of late from the preference just shown by Jesus to Peter，John，and James，and which had excited the envy of the rest of the disciples，and perhaps some pride in the bosoms of those preferred．The seeming diversity in the narrations of the Evan－ gelists as to the mode in which this matter came before Christ，is satisfactorily adjusted by the harmonists．Meî́os，for $\mu$ é $\mathbf{i}$ oros，the Com－ mentators say．But it is perbaps not necessary to suppose that；for the disciples seem to have desired to know，not who should be the greatest， but who should be great，and fill the more consi－ derable posts in the Court of the Messiah．So Wets．，＇quis erit imperator？quis consiliarius？ quis procurator？＇The notion（common to all the Jews）that the Messiah would erect a tem－ poral kingdom，they yet clung to，and never laid aside till fully enlightened at the descent of the Holy Spirit．
2．ėढтngev aùrd－aùt $\omega \bar{\nu}$ ］Thus employing a method of instruction always prevalent in the East，namely that of emblems，and symbolical actions．See Joh．xiii．4．\＆14．xx．22．xxi． 19. From Ecclesiastical tradition we learn that the child was the afterwards distinguished martyr， Ignatius．
 bitiousness，humility，docility，and absence of a worldly minded spirit，dispositions the very re－ verse to those which they were then indulging． Comp． 1 Cor．xiv．20．Our Lord proceeds to show that he who evinces the dispositions thus enjoined shall be distinguished in the spiritual kingdom which he comes to establish．
 verse is evidently directed to the Apootles；while
















this and the following seem not suitable to them; and therefore the connexion laid down by the Commentators is harsh. The following may be admitted. 'And remember for your encouragement in your Apostolic labours, my maxim is, He that receiveth' \&c. But perhaps the verses in question were addressed to some bystanders, for to the people at large it would be very suitable.
6. $\mu \kappa \kappa \bar{\omega} \nu$ ] i.e. disciples generally, without reference to age or quality. The words rढ̈̄ע тгनtevóntay are exegetical of the preceding. ミuдфéper aürū. Some supply $\mu \bar{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$, i. e. rather than he should commit such a crime. But that is not very necessary. Múdos duckós. The Commentators generally understand by this the upper of the two mill-stones, called in Heb. , רכ, as riding on the other. Others understand a mill-stone turned by an ass, and consequently larger than that turned by the hand. The expression $\sigma u \mu \phi$ épet-кататоитьनөȳ seems to be proverbial. The punishment in question, though not in use among the Jews themselves, was so in the surrounding nations, where it was inflicted on criminals of the worst sort; as sacrilegious persons, parricides \&c. See Rec. Syn. Me入áyet тīs $\theta a \lambda a \sigma \sigma \eta s$, 'depth of the sea.' A somewhat rare phrase, which preserves the primitive sense of $\pi e \lambda a y o s$, namely $a$ depth. For $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi l$ before $\tau \delta \nu$ toá $\mathbf{x}$. very many MSS. have cis, which is edited by Wets., Matth., Griesh., Vater, and Fritz. ; and perhaps upon just grounds. Yet as the point is not certain, I have retained the common reading.

7: $\sigma \kappa a \nu \delta \partial^{\lambda} \lambda \omega \nu$ ] i. e. those just adverted to ; arising from the calamities and persecutions which awaited the professors of Christianity, and are supposed to have been present to the mind of our Lord and his Apostles, and which Middlet. thinks are referred to in the Article. 'Avá ${ }^{\prime}$ yap \&c. The necessity here mentioned is conditional; and we may paraphrase this and the parallel passage of Luke as follows: 'it cannot
but happen that offences ( $\sigma \kappa d \nu \delta \alpha \lambda \alpha$ ) circumstances which obstruct the reception, or occasion the abandonment of the faith, should occur ; whether occasioned by persecution, denial of the common offices of humanity, contempt, \&c. From ver. 8. \& 9. it should seem that the oка́ydala here mentioned were not only those by which we draw others into sin, but also ourselves, by the indulgence of any wordly minded affections. The argument is, that though, from the corruption of human nature, and the abuse of men's free agency, offences must needs arise, yet so terrible are the consequences of those offences, that it is better to endure the greatest deprivations, or corporeal pain.
10. $\dot{\phi} \alpha \bar{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \mu \eta$ катафроעท்бทтe \&c.] From persecution in general, our Lord proceeds to warn against pride and contempt towards the persons in question. And this admonition is urged from two reasons, each introduced by a $\gamma \dot{\alpha} p: 1$. The care with which God watches over his meanest servants ; And 2., from the love of Christ shown equally unto them by his laying down his life for their sakes as well as their more honoured brethren. It is plain that this admonition is meant for such as were become disciples. 'Evods signifies any one, emphatically. As to the first reason, it is an argumentum ad hominem, adverting to the general belief of the Jews (retained among the early Christians, and professed by several of the Fathers) that every person, or at least the good, had his attendant angel. These are said at Heb. i. 14. to be "ministering, spirits to those who shall be heirs of salvation." This angelic attendant they regarded as the representative of the person, and even as bearing a personal resemblance to him, nay standing in the same favour with God as the person himself. Thus the scope of the passage is obvious. Bגe-
 \&c., in accordance with the Oriental custom by which none were allowed to see the monarch but those who were in especial favour with him.



















 autav.
11. Tod dxo入em ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$ ] 'whatever is lost.'
12. The connexion seems to be this: "You may Gigure to yourselves the grief and anger which the Almighty feels at one of his faithful being seduced away, by the joy which he feels at the recovery of one that had, gone astray ; which is like that of the shepherd," \&cc. Tí úpiv doкei (in which words the init is emphatic) is a formula, showing that the thing is illustrated by what takes place with themselves, and in the erdinary occurrences of life. At id $\pi \lambda a \nu \omega^{\prime}-$
 ceding, sub. тро́ßaтоу. In èvеעทкоутаеעує́a the Art. denotes the remainder of the whole number, as often in Herodot., Thucyd., and others of the Classical writers.

Erasm., Rosenm., and Kuin. rightly construe
 Lake xV . 4. where by the $d \pi i \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \rho \eta$ are meant the mountain pastures, as $d^{2} \nu \quad{ }^{\text {e }} \boldsymbol{j} \mu \varphi$ in Luke signifies the pastures. Now the mountains in the East (from their attracting the clouds and abowers) are the especial places for pasture, as appears from various passages of Scripture and the Classical writers cited in Rec. Syn.
15. Some think there is here no connexion with the preceding verses, and that what is now introduced, was pronounced at another time. Others imagine that from the offended our Lord proceeds to the offending party, shewing how to reclaim a sinner, and the course to be pursued with him when incorrigible; lst, by private reproof; 2 dly , by pablic remonstrance before persons of credit and reputation. In both cases there is an allusion to the custom of the Mosaic law, on which the canons of the primitive Church
 in a general acceptation, as often in Thucyd.
 as a flagitious person, and one whose intercourse is to be avoided, as that of heathens and publicans.'
 words see Note supra xvi. 19. It must not, however, be here taken in the same extent as there, but (as the best Commentators are agreed) be limited by the connexion with the preceding context, and the circumstances of the case in question. We may thus paraphrase: 'Whatever ye shall determine and appoint respecting such an offender, whether as to his removal from the Christian society, if obdurate and incorrigible, or his readmission into it on repentance, 1 will ratify; and whatever guidance ye ask from heaven in forming those determinations, shall be granted you, so that there be two or three who unite in the determination or the prayer.' Hence it is obvious that, in their primary and strict sense, the words and the promise have reference to the Apostles alone, however they may, in a qualified sense, apply to Christians of every age.
 quacunque re, there is a Hebraism. Fevirerat ajuois is not a Hebraism only, but a frequent Grecism, nay a Latinism. Els тd d $\mu \delta \nu \overline{\partial \nu} \mu \alpha$
 sense is, 'on my behalf, in the service of me and my religion.' $\Delta$ úo $\hat{\eta}$. тpeis, i.e. very few. A certain for an uncertain, but very small, number. So the Rabbinical writers said that wherever two are sitting conversing on the law, there the Sche-





















chinah is among them. 'Ev $\mu$ dow aùr $\bar{\omega} \nu$, viz. by my assistance. So the Latin adesse alicui.
21. тобג́кıs $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho т \operatorname{ligetl}^{\prime}$ This comes under Winer's rule, (Gr. Gr. Nov. Test. § 39.5 .) "Two finite verbs are sometimes so connected, that the first one is to be taken as a participle. Matt. xviii. 21. xvii. 20. ." This is accounted a Hebraism; but it is, in fact, common to all languages in the early periods, and in the popular style. 'ETTdкıs. The number seven was called the complete or full number, and therefore was commonly used to denote multitude or frequency.
 an uncertain and unlimited number. The meaning is, 'as often as he offend, and truly repent.'
 Gr. Nov. Test. $\$ 30.1$.
23. dad тoüTo This is not (as Kuin. thinks) a mere formula transitionis, but is to be considered as put elliptically; q. d. 'Wherefore (because pardon of injuries is to be unlimitedly granted to the repentant) the Gospel Dispensation, and the conduct of God therein, may be compared with that of a King in the following
 to be a pleonasm, but it may be considered as one of the reliques of the wordiness of antique phraseology. इuyãpaı $\lambda$ óyov, like rationes conferre in Latin, signifies to bring together and
 Levit. xxv. 50. $\Delta o u ́ \lambda \omega v$. Not slaves, but ministers, or officers in the receipt or disbursement of money; of what sort, is not certain.
24. $\mu v \rho i \omega \nu$ тa入áyтcuv] i. e. of silver; for in all numbers occurring in antient authors gold is never to be supposed, unless mentioned. The
amount is estimated at one million eight hundred and seventy-five thousand pounds.

 to the custom of all the nations of early antiquity. Among the Jews, however, this bondage only extended to six years.
26. $\left.\mu \alpha \kappa \rho \circ \theta \dot{\nu} \mu \eta \sigma o \nu \dot{d} \pi^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \circ 1\right]$ This is well rendered in E.V. 'have patience with me,' as the Latin indulge, expecta. So Artemid. Onir. iv. 12.
 word occurs also with $\mathrm{d}^{2}$ ] in Ecclus. xxv. 18.
28. кратทंबas éxyıyє] 'he seized him by the
 in the Classical writers, of the seizing of debtors by creditors, to drag them before a magistrate, in order to compel them to pay a debt. Ei Tt. There is the strongest evidence, both external and internal, for this reading, which is preferred by almost every Editor and Commentator of note. It is the reading of the Edit. Princ., and most of the early Edd. and nearly all the MSS. The common one $\%, \tau \iota$ is doubtless a gloss.: The sense is the very same, for the el is not conditional. Of this phrase there are many examples in the Classical writers, as Diog. Laert. cited by Wets.

29. тávтal There is very strong authority in MSS., early Editions, Versions, and Fathers, for the omission of the word, which is rejected by Mill and Wets., and cancelled by Matth. and Griesb. Yet it is found in the old Syriac Version, and its genuineness is well defended by Fritz.
 of grief and indignation. $\Delta \iota e \sigma \dot{\alpha} \phi \eta \sigma a \nu$, 'gave full information of all that had happened.'







 т ${ }^{\prime} \mu a \tau \alpha a \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$.








34. קacavcotaîs,] I have shown in Recens. Synop. that the sense is not tormentors, but jailors, ie $\mu$ офú入aкes, Acts xvi. 23. and 24 ; as Paíapos sometimes signified a jail. And so we say a house of correction. This will sufficiently account for the use, unless we suppose that the jailors obtained the name $\beta$ aбaviorat, because to them was committed the charge of torture.
 anime in Latin, often occurs in the Classical writers. T'̈ $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \pi \tau \dot{\omega} \mu \alpha \tau \alpha \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$. These words are cancelled by Griesb. and others, but on slender authority, and, as Schulz and Fritz. have proved, they are necessary to the sense.
 simple as they seem, have occasioned much perplexity to Interpreters. Not to notice some strange misconceptions, and unauthorized methods of removing the difficulty, even the method proposed by Guin. and others, namely, to take xépa tout 'I op $\delta \dot{\text { dey }}$ tout 'I opJávou, cannot be admitted; for, besides its doing violence to Grammar, there is no proof that any part of Pera was accounted as Judæa. The best mode of removing the difficulty is to
 'Iopdayov, which is found in the parallel passage of Mark, the authority of which is so strong in confirmation, that we need not attend to any exceptions taken to the propriety of the Greek. Jesus, it seems, purposely chose the longer course through the country beyond Jordan to that through Samaria. Ta 'pta Tjis'I. is for els Tiv 'I ovzaiay.
2. ixei.] 'There, on the spot.' By aurous is meant such of them as needed healing.
3. In $\lambda$ éyoutes aìtẹ, el, \&c. there is a blending of the oration directa and indirecta; on which Whiner's Gr. Gr. p. 182. and other examples in Luke xiii. 23. Acts i. 6. xxi. 37. Genes, xvii.
17. By of Фapıaiot understand those of the neighbouring country.

- el $\ddagger \xi \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota v, \& c$.] The insidious motive of this question is apparent by a comparison of this with the parallel passage in Luke xvi. 18., where the judgment of Christ respecting the unlawfulness of divorce is given in illustration of his assurance that the law should endure for ever. Their hope was, by inducing Jesus to again deliver his judgment on this point, to embroil him with the School of Hillel, which taught that divorces were allowable even on trivial grounds.
- $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega^{\prime} \pi \omega_{0}$ ] for $\dot{d} \nu \delta \rho \rho$, say many Commentaters. But that is not necessary; for the word may, in such cases, be taken in its natural sense, or be regarded as put for $\tau t s$.
- ккca'] 'proper.' It is no Hebraism, since examples of this signification are found not only in the Sept., but in the best Greek writers from Homer to Pausanias.
- xã $\sigma a \nu$ ] 'any whatever.' A use of $x a \bar{s}$ occurring in Rom. iii. 20. Gal. ii. 16. 1 Cor. x. 25., but very rarely in the Classical writers, though an example is adduced from Polybius.
- alicia.] The word here simply means cause, (which, indeed, is its primitive significasion) not fault, as some Commentators explain; a misconception productive of the gloss (for such it is) which in some MSS. was introduced in the place of altiay.

4. $\left.\dot{\delta} \pi o r \eta^{\prime} \sigma a s\right]$ The Commentators take this as a participle for a noun, i.e. the Creator; a frequent idiom in Scripture, but not necessary to be supposed here, since (as I observed in Recensio Synoptica, and since that time Fritz. in loc.) $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \pi o \nu$ in a collective sense (in reference to which we have aurous just after) must be supplied from the preceding divopoijxe. Dr. Bland strangely blends both the above primciples. At á $\rho \sigma$ eu and $\theta \bar{\eta} \lambda u$ sub. yévos and $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \dot{ }$
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5. eixev•] i. e. by the mouth of Adam, while speaking under the direction, and by the inspiration of God.

- тробко $\lambda \lambda_{\eta} \theta_{\eta}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ eтat] shall be closely connected, as by glue. A strong metaphor often occurring in the New Testament, and also found in the Heb PבT, and the Latin agglutinare. Of the word in the sense here meant (close attachment) I have in Recensio Synoptica adduced an example from Athenæus, p. 617. A. The var. lect. кo $\lambda \lambda \eta \theta$ in $\sigma e \tau a l$, found in many MSS. and Fathers, and edited by Fritz., is possibly the true reading.
- eis $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa a \quad \mu\langle\alpha \nu$.$] A Hebraism for \sigma \dot{d} \rho \xi$ mia, (See Winer's Gr. Gr. \{ 22. 3.) i. e., one and the same person. So Plato says ẅare ठúo ð̈utas èva yơovéval.

6. $\delta$ oüy There seems to be a tacit reference to $\gamma \dot{\text { evos, }}$ as denoting each of the sexes.

- $\sigma \nu \nu E \in \epsilon \cup \xi \in \nu$,] The sense is " arctissimè consociavit ;" by a metaphor taken from the yoking of oxen, and common to both the Greek and Latin, nay perhaps all languages.

7. ̇ेvereĩaro, \&c.] Moses does not command them to divorce their wives, but, when they shall divorce them, to give them a writing of divorcement. An objection is here proposed. "If the bond of matrimony be perpetual, why did Moses permit divorce, and why did he permit her that was divorced to be married again?" Answ. "But every thing permitted by the law of the land is not just and equitable." On this and the two following verses see Notes on Matth. v. 31. seq.
8. Mwoñs] i. e. not God; so that it is, as Jerome says, a consilium hominis, not imperium Dei. Moses (observes Grotius) is named as the promulgator, not of a common, primæval, and perpetual law, but of one only Jewish, given in reference to the times. The sum of Christ's words, Theophylact observes, is this: "Moses wisely restrained by civil regulations your licen-
tiousness, and permitted divorce only under certain conditions, and that because of your brutality, lest you should perpetrate something worse, namely, make away with them by sword or poison.". See Whitby on this and the preceding verse.
 naciam, vel pervicaciam; or, to express the full sense of $\pi \rho d s$, (with Fritz.), pertinacia vestra ratione habitta.
$-\frac{d \pi}{} \pi^{\prime} d \rho \chi \bar{\eta}$ ] ' antiquitus,' as in Herodot. ii. 104. and elsewhere.
9. $\dot{\eta}$ alria-Yuvaıкds ${ }^{3}$ ] ' the case or condition of men with their wives.? Both words have the Article, as being Correlatives. (Middlet.) This use of altia is forensic, and akin to that of the Latin causa. Nay, this is thought by some Commentators a Latinism.
 esse; but it is so -netimes used metaphorically of capability, whether of the mind, or (as here) of the action. Thus the sense is, 'all are not capable of practising this maxim, or, as the best Commentators render, 'this thing.'

- oTs dédorat. 1 scil. èк $\Theta$ єoü, as in 1 Cor.vii. 7. Yet not without the co-operation of man, as appears from the words following.

12. èvoouxıбav $\dot{\text { E. }}$.] A strongly figurative ex-
 v. 29. \& 30 . xviii. 8. \& 9. The Commentators comparea asimilarexpression from Julian, to which may be added Max. Tyr. Diss. 34. ${ }^{\alpha} \phi \in \lambda \epsilon$ тiv


- 义upeirco.] ' let him use his ability, i.e. of performing it.' Or, as Fritz, renders, 'qui capere, h. e. viribus suis sustinere potest, sustineat.? Here the Imperative has rather the force of permision than injunction; or, at any rate, the admonition must, like that of St. Paul, 1 Cor. vii. 26., have reference chiefly to the circumstances under which it was delivered.















 the earliest ages had been in use among the Jews on imploring God's blessing upon any person, and was especially employed by the Prophets, (Num. xxvii. 18. 2 Kings v. 11.) and afterwards by elders, or men noted for piety. These children therefore were brought to Christ for his blesing, and to be admitted into his discipleship. That they were not brought to be healed of any disorder, but to obtain spiritual blessings, is plain; and that they were not only considered capable of receiving them by the people, but also by our Lord himseff, is equally clear. Thus we are warranted in bringing infants ( $\beta \rho^{\prime} \dot{\phi} \eta$ ) to Christ in baptism, to be thereby admitted into his church, and to receive the spiritual blessings communicated by that Sacrament.

15. غкecïđv.] i. e. from that part of Perea, or rather Judza, where he had been staying. See Mart x. 17.
16. eis] for $\tau$ ss. This was, as we find from v. 22., a young man, a ruler, as we learn from Luke xvili. 18., by which some suppose to be mean a ruler of the Synagogue; others, a member of the Sanhedrim. His conduct seems to thave been dictated by a real desire to be put into the way of salvation, and a sincere intention of following Christ's injunctions, which, however, proved too hard for a disposition in which avarice prevailed.

- Ti áaaOdy-alajviov;] This question is thought to have reference to the Pharisaical division of the precepts of the law into the weighty, and the light. The young man, it seems, was puzzled by the nice distinctions which were made in classing those precepts, and wished to have some clear information as to what was pre-eminently promotive of salvation.
 Whitby) givest thou me a title not ascribed to your renowned Rabbis, nor due to any mere man? Thinkest thou there is in me any thing more than human, or that the Father dwelleth in me? This thou oughtest to believe, if thou conceivest this title truly doth belong to me.' In the present and preceding verses are some remartable various readings. 'Aya $\theta \dot{\delta} y$ is omitted;


 readings are found in several MSS. of the Alexandrian recension, are supported by some Versions and Fathers, and are adopted by Erasm., Grot., Mill, and Beng.; and the two last are received into the Text by Griesb.; but on very insufficient grounds. The evidence for the first is next to nothing; and that for the two others but slender; only some six MSS., besides a few Versions and Fathers of inferior order. Whereas the common reading is supported by nearly the whole of the MSS., one half of the Versions, especially the Syriac, and, of the Fathers, by Justin Martyr, Chrysost., Ambrose, Euthym., Theophyl., Hilar., and others; besides being strongly confirmed by the internal evidence arising from the connexion of the thought. It is therefore, with reason, retained by Wets., Matth., and Knapp, and restored by Vater, Tittmann, Fritz., and Scholz. The origin of the alterations is well traced by Wets., Matthæi, and Nolan, p. 471. to a groundless fear of some pious, but misjudging persons, who thought that the words afforded evidence against the divinity of Christ (and hence the Unitarians have not omitted to press the text into their service); but utterly without reason, if the object which our Lord has in view be but considered. See Whitby, Doddr., and Campb., and the able remarks of Nolan on Gr. Vulg. p. 471. seqq.
- тas d $\nu \tau 0 \lambda \alpha{ }^{2}$ s.] namely, of God, as comprehended in the Decalogue; for though our Lord adduces his instances only from the laws of the second table, yet he virtually confirms all of them. See further remarks in Lightf. and Whitby.

18. aoias;] for tivas, quasnam? A usage frequent also in the Sept.
19. ťk עєó́TทTos] ‘from my boyhood, or childhood;' for the word veóт. must be accommodated to the $\nu \in a \nu i \sigma x o s$ at ver. 22. It is indeed a phrase, simply denoting ab ineunte ætate.'
 what am I yet behind hand,' or wanting?
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 ['்َтı.]
20. tenetos,] The term is here used not only in the moral sense, by which God is said to be perfect, but in that comparative sense by which a thing is perfect so far as the constitution of it permits. It therefore denotes a true Christian, and such as will be accepted by God. See Rom. xii. 2. 2 Phil. iii. 13. Col. i. 28. \& iv. 12. James iii. 2.
 your love to God and obedience to me his Messenger, by selling your goods and following my cause. The injunction was only binding on the individual thus addressed, or, at any rate, on those similarly circumstanced, as in the Apostolic age; and has no relation to Christians of the present or any other period. See Lightr., Whitby, and Mackn.
The use of $\mathrm{v} \pi$ aye just before is like that at xviii. 15. Mark x. 21., and is said by some Commentators to be pleonastic. But it rather raises the force of the injunction, and may be rendered 'begone!'

- $\delta \in \hat{u} \rho o]$ This is explained by the Commentators as put for $i \lambda \theta \dot{d}$; whereas the truth is, there is an ellipsis of $\& \lambda \theta \xi$ or the like, which is supplied in Hom. Od. p. Aeûpo Moür' è $\lambda \hat{\prime}$.

22. мvтоט́ $\left.\mu \in \nu 0{ }^{\circ} \cdot\right]$ Participle for adjective.

- $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\nu}$ है $\chi$ © $\nu$.] 'he was in possession.' Or the sense may be, 'he chanced to possess.' See Matth. Gr. Gr. 559.9.

- $\pi \lambda$ oúvos] That is, if he place his trust in his riches, and make them his summum bonum; a necessary limitation, as appears from the parallel passage at Mark x. 23.
- $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda e i a \nu$ т $\bar{\omega} \nu$ oiv $\rho a \nu \bar{\omega} \nu$.$] This is by some$ explained of the Church, then about to be founded: by others, of the state of those who are admitted to heaven. In whichever sense the expression be here taken, it will hold alike true; (as is the case with many such sort of declarations in Scripture) but yet the latter seems to be the preferable mode of interpretation.
 (as we find from the Rabbinical illustrators) so similar a proverb in use among the Jews, that we may pronounce this also to be a mode of expressing hyperbolically any thing next to impossible.
- $\kappa \alpha ́ \mu \eta \lambda o \nu]$ Some antient and modern Commentators would read $\kappa \dot{\alpha} \mu \Lambda \lambda o \nu$, a cable, rope; or take $\kappa \alpha \mu \eta \lambda o \nu$ in that sense. But for the former there is little or no manuscript authority; and for the latter no support from the usus loquendi. That the common reading and interpretation must be retained, all the best Commentators are agreed. Not so in the common reading $\delta_{r e} \lambda \theta \in i v$, for which many MSS., several Versions, and some Fathers read clae $\theta$ eiv, which is preferred by Wets., and edited by Matthzei, Knapp, Griesb., Vater, and Scholz ; though the common reading is restored by Tittm. and Fritz. The arguments on both sides are so nearly equal that though the evidence of MSS. and Versions is rather in favour of the new reading, yet there is no sufficient reason to abandon the common one, which is found in Mark x. 25. and several MSS., in Luke xviii. 25. I have therefore retained it, but with the mark of uncertainty.
- jaфiठos] Later Greek for $\beta \in \lambda$ óvns, from คáлтw. The sense is literally a sewing utensil.

25. auvoū,] This is omitted in many MSS. of various recensions, and some Versions of Fathers, and is cancelled by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz, perhaps rightly.

- Tis divazai $\sigma$.] This is generally interpreted, 'who then can be saved? since all men are either rich, or desire to be so.' But that is a somewhat violent mode of interpretation, and therefore it is better, with Euthym. and Markl., to suppose an ellipsis of $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi \lambda o u \sigma i \omega \nu$, and interpret ' what rich man, then, can be saved?'

26. ${ }^{e} \mu \beta \lambda$ é $\psi \alpha a s$ ] 'fixing his eyes upon them." There is a similar use at Mark x. 21. and 27. xiv. 67. Luke xx. 17. and elsewhere; in which places the word must not, (with many recent Commentators,) be regarded as nearly pleonastic, or as having the sense turning towards, but must retain its full force.
 said to be Hebraic, and the Commentators tell us that the Greeks use the simple dative with ठúvatov or dóvivaróv dort. But the meaning is somewhat different, and we may render, 'as far as concerns (the powers of).'

- aibúvarov] Le Clerc ap. Elsley and most recent Commentators, as Kuin. and Fritz., take the word in the qualified sense estremely difficult,












$2 s$ also at Luke xviii．27．and Heb．vi．4．But I agree with Rose ap．Parkhurst，p．16．a．that －the affixing of this sense to passages containing $a$ doetrixe，which is altered by the translation，is improper．＂．We are therefore to leave the full sense，as intimating that in the work of salvation human nature is insufficient of itself，and stands in need of the aids of Divine grace．
＇Earl is omitted in very many MSS．of various recessions，and is cancelled by Griesb．，Tittm．， Fritz．，and Scholz．
27．Ti a pa écтat ai $\mu \boldsymbol{i v}$ ；］＇what，then，shall be our reward，＇namely，in heaven．Said with re－
 oupayö．

28．Er тй та入ıyүevecia，］The opinions of Commentators are exceedingly divided on the sense of this obscure expression，which in some measure depends upon the construction．By some，as Beta，Calvin，Gatak．，and the authors of our common Version，it is taken with the are－ ceding words；by several of the Fathers，and Grot．，Hamm．，Kypke，and most Commentators， it is taken with the following；and the best re－ cent Commentators，as Kuin．and Fritz．，are
 work，to commence with the resurrection and the day of judgment，when all things should，as it were，be born again：＇a view of the sense confirmed by the antient Versions and the Greek Commentators．Others，as Lightfoot，interpret it．＂in the regeneration，renovation，or new state of things which the Gospel Dispensation is to introduce．＇
－к al ijeêc］This is not，as Kain．supposes， redundant，but a repetition of the preceding， continuandi caus，et gravitatis ergo．
－кa0íreote—＞oū＇I $\sigma \rho a \eta$ ind．］These are figu－ rative expressions denoting a high degree of glory and power．Kpivetiv in the sense of hold－ ing authority over，is found in the Sept．；nor is it without example in the Classical writers．

29．or ］Several MSS．almost wholly of the Alexandrian recension have öotts，which is re－ ceived by Knapp，Tittm．and Vat．，and also Griesb．in his two first Editions，though it has been rejected in his third．The common reading is likewise restored by Fritz．and Scholz；and rightly，since öorts，though better Greek，seems to be a correction of the Alexandrian critics． This reading is，moreover，confirmed by Luke mi．8．\＆10．and Acts ii． 21.
－éкатоутат入agiona $\lambda$ in $\psi$ ert，］．Mark and
 by several of the antient and some modern Com－ mentators，as Grot．，Brig．，and Wets．，of the temporal advantages and blessings，namely，sur－ tenance and comfort at the hands of their Chris－ than brethren．But it is far better to understand it，with Maldon．，of spiritual blessings，even the satisfaction arising from a good conscience and the consolations of the Gospel，which all that is most prized of earthly goods cannot，however multiplied，equal in value．And，indeed，the addition of $\mu e r \alpha \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \omega \gamma \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ in Mark seems ta require this sense．

30．то八入ol $\delta$ ѐ－трӣтol．］A sort of proverbial mode of expression often employed by our Lord to check the presumption of the Apostles．The sense is，that many of the Jews，to whom the blessings of Christ＇s kingdom were first offered， should be the last to partake of them；and that many of the Gentiles，to whom they were to be offered after the Jews，would be the first to enjoy them．In illustration of this our Lord delivered the parable at the beginning of the next chapter，（ 80 that the division is here inju－ dicious）in which，as I have shown at large in Recens．Synop．，the application is not to be limited，but left general，being introduced for the instructions of all Christians．

XX．1．＇OMoia $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\alpha} \rho, \& c$ ．］The sense is，＇The same thing will take place in the Christian Dis－ pensation that occurred in the management of a certain master of a family．＇

The Commentators remark on the pleonasm in $\alpha \nu 0 \rho \omega^{\prime} \pi c$ ，of which there are many similar examples in Scripture．and which they regard as a Hebraism．But，as I have shown in Recensio Synop．，there are instances of it in the Greek Classical writers，especially Herodotus．It may， therefore，better be regarded as a vestige of the wordiness of primitive diction．It must be re－ membered，too，that the idiom in question is almost wholly confined to words which were originally adjectives．
This Parable is found，though with a widely extended application，in the Jerusalem Talmud． ＂Here it is meant（says Waterland）to represent God＇s dealings with mankind in respect to their outward call to the means of grace，as well as to the retribution in a state of glory．In this simile，（which commences with an hypallage， as Matt．xiii．24．\＆48．）as in many others，some



















things do not correspond，namely，those which only respect the ornament，and do not affect the scope of the parable；as the labourers waiting to be hired，and the murmurings，\＆c．of the labourers after the distribution of the wages． The main point of similarity is the rejection of those who were first，and the admission of those who seemed last．＂
$-\ddot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \pi \rho \omega t{ }_{t}$ This is regarded by the Com－ mentators as an elliptical expression for ä $\mu \alpha$ $\sigma \nu \nu \pi$ ．But the association occurs in the Sept．， not in the Greek Classical writers．Whereas $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha$ with similar words is of frequent occurrence with nouns of time．I know，however，of no example with $\pi \rho \omega t$ t，which may be regarded， （with Scheid on Lennep，）as properly a Dative of the old noun mpwis，as the Latin herr from heris．
－$\sigma u \mu \phi$ courigas］＇having agreed with them．＇ This signification is very rare in the Classical writers，but one example is adduced from Diodor． Sic．
－$\left.e^{\prime} \delta \eta \nu a \rho i o u\right]$ at or for a denarius．This mode of denoting price（which occurs also at Matt．xxvii．7．）is rarely found in the Classical writers，and only in the later ones．The earlier and best writers use the Genitive simply．The denarius，which was equivalent to the Greek drachma，was then the usual wages of a la－ Dourer，as also of a soldier．At тทì 立épav sub． cis．

3．$\tau \dot{\eta} \mathrm{y}]$ This is omitted in very many of the MSS．，including all the most antient ones，and some Fathers．It is cancelled by Wets．，Math．， Griesb．，Knapp，Tittm．，Fritz．，and Scholz；and rightly；for in such common phrases the Article was usually omitted．Indeed ordinals are usu－ ally anarthrous．
－غ̇のтஸิтas－d $\rho$ yous．］The very place where （from its being used for buying and selling，and all public business）the greatest number of per－ sons assembled，especially the idle or unem－ cloyed；illustrations of which may be seen in Recens．Synop．The time here mentioned was equivalent to what was called the $\pi \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta_{0} \cup \sigma \alpha$ àopá．
4．ii $\pi \dot{\alpha} \gamma \in \tau e]$ begone．
－${ }^{2} \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu$ for $\hat{\alpha} \nu$ ．In which use with the Sub－ junctive（rare in the Classical writers）it answers to the Latin cunque and our soever．
－לikatov，］i．e．not what was legally due， but what was reasonable．
6．$\alpha \rho \gamma o u s$, ，This is cancelled by Griesb．and Vaster，with the approbation of Guin．；but there is very little authority for its omission，and it is well defended by Fritz．
 to the Roman procurator and our bailiff．
－$\tau \delta \nu \mu \tau \theta \partial \nu$, ］i．e．the wages agreed on．
－$\alpha \rho \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \nu о \Omega-\pi \rho \omega^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ ．］The construction of this passage has been mistaken by Kypke and Ruin．，and is thus rightly laid down by Fritz．：




－ávà］This is said by the Commentators to be put adverbially；and they refer to a plena
 is，in fact，an ellipse of éкабтov．
10．oi $\pi \rho \bar{\omega} \tau o \iota]$ scil．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \in \sigma \tau a \lambda \mu$ évoı．
11．olкодебтóтou］the master of the family， or husbandman．
12．octroi oi er $\sigma x a t o l]$ This use of the pro－ noun implies contempt．







 ò入íyot dè éклектоí.








- غтoincav,] Some explain it confecerunt, spent. But although examples are adduced proving this sense of moteì and the Latin facere with nouns of time; yet it is better, with the best recent Commentators, to take it for el $\rho \gamma \alpha^{\alpha}-$ cairo, by an Hebraism formed on aw, as in Ruth ii. 19. Math. xxi. 28. And so facers agram in Columella.
- thous] for loouoipovs.
 form with $\delta \omega^{\prime} \sigma \omega \nu, \phi \omega^{\prime} \sigma \omega \nu, \sigma \in i \sigma \omega \nu, a \dot{a} \xi \omega \nu, \mu \dot{\jmath} \xi \omega \nu$, sec. literally signifies the burner, the burning (wind) Eurus; as is often to be found in the Sept. Hence it may be explained simply heat,

 it is $ח$, i.e. the shriveller, the drier. It is to be remembered that, in the East, though the air be cool in the early part of the day, yet during the remainder of it, the heat of the sun is exceedingly scorching.

13. غ̇aīpe,] An idiom common both to the Heb.
 bone cir, optime homo ; being a familiar form of address, and consequently often used to inferiors, and sometimes to strangers or indifferent persons.
 that, though there be some things in the Gospel dispensation different from what we should expet, yet the whole is agreeable to strict justice.

## 15. ii oúx] Anton.


 expression, of which the sense is, 'art thou envious?' Fritz. well annotates thus: 'Nam invidentia, ut aliarum animi perturbationum, indices oculi runt. Hing factum, ut Hebraic hominem invidum appellarent 1 y $y$.'.' (Prov. xxviii. 22.
16. oürcos] i. e. as it was in the case of the labourers last hired by the master.
 to be an allusion to the Roman mode of enlisting soldiers. By the $\kappa \lambda \eta$ col we are to understand those who are invited into the Christian Church,
and obey the call, those who are professedly
 proved. Markland regards it as a proverbial
 тav̄poı д̀̀ $\tau \epsilon$ Baкхol. And he translates, 'there are many called ones, but few choice ones.' The scope of the parable is meant for all Christians, and signifies, 'many will embrace my religion, but few will so receive it as to be approved by God.'
17. dyakaivmp els 'I.] Said with reference to the elevated situation of Jerusalem. Thus similar expressions occur in Homer, as Od. á. 210., and frequently in Joseph. and the Sept. How antient this custom was, we find from its mention in Ps. cxxii. 3. \& 4.

- aa $\alpha \in \lambda a \beta \epsilon]$ took them aside.
- кa ${ }^{2}$ dian $]$ apart; namely, from the mustitude which was accompanying Jesus to the Passover.
 taken improprie, (for the Jews had no power of life and death,) and is more definitely expressed
 $\theta a \nu$ átou. which words have reference to the sentence êvo os Өaváтou dort. Fritz, says that the sense of катакрivelv тıva өaváтبя is' to devote any one to death.' But the expression rather signifies, by a blending of two senses, to condemn any one, so that he shall be delivered to death. By étpegt the Romans are plainly meant ; for crucifixion was a Roman punishment. The minute particularity of this prediction is astonishing, and is a remarkable proof of the prophetic spirit with which Christ was enduad; for, humanly speaking, it was far more probable that he should have been either assisinoted, in a transport of popular fury, or stoned, by the orders of the Sanhedrim, especially as Pilate had given them permission to judge him according to their own law. But all this was done, that the Scripture might be fulfilled.

 of which will be, that he will be, \&c.
${ }^{2}$ Supr. 4 21. Marc 10

35. 












20. $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \eta \rho$, \&c.] Namely, Salome, mother of James and John, Mark v. $40 . \&$ xvi. 1. She had doubtless followed him from Galiee, with other pious women who attended on our Lord in his journies. The request she made seems to have originated in the promise just made to the Apostles of sitting on twelve thrones, \&c.

- $\mu e \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ uic̄̀ a.]. This shows that they participated in the petition; and though they preferred it through the medium of their mother, yet it should seem that they were principally concerned. Thus Mark is justified in representing them as asking it. And indeed that they are regarded as the principals, is clear from our Lord's addressing the answer to them.
 the Eastern custom by which proximity of situation next the throne denotes the degree of dignity; and consequently the first situations on the right and left denote the highest dignity. See 1 Kings ii. 19. Ps. xliv. 9. as also the Classical citations adduced by the Philological annotators.
- $\sigma o \bar{u}$. This is added in almost all the best MSS., and Versions, and is with reason received by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz.
 comprehend the nature of my kingdom, which will rather call you to suffer with me than to enjoy honour or temporal advantage, under me. Alteícoe, 'ye ask for yourselves.' Observe the force of the middle voice. Fritz. maintains that the scope of the answer is not well discerned, and that it is this: ' non reputare illos, non nisi qui tantas, quantas ipse perlaturus sit, calamitates superasset, tanto honore potiri posse.'
 with the Hebrews, who thus compared God's benefits to a liberal entertainment; and usually compared whatever was dealt out to men by the Almighty (whether good or evil) to a cup of wine. Nor was this confined to the Hebrews; for, as it was customary among the antients in general to assign to each guest at a feast a particular cup, as well as dish; and by the kind and quantity of the liquor contained in it the respect of the entertainer was expressed: hence cup came in general to signify a portion assigned, (Psal. xvi. 5. xxiii. 5.) whether of pleasure, or sorrow ; as Hom. I1. w. 524, where see Heyne. See also Hierocl. upon that Pythago-
ræan sentence cos $\dot{\alpha} y \mu o i ̄ p a \nu$ éxys. But the expression was more frequently used of evil than of good. See examples in Recens. Syn.
 metaphor of immersion in water, as expressive of being overwhelmed by affliction, is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers; (see examples in Recens. Synop.) with this difference, however, that in the latter is usually added some word expressive of the evil or afflic-
 $\theta \bar{\eta} \nu a l$ and каi $\tau \dot{d} \beta \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \iota \sigma \mu \alpha-\beta a \pi \tau \iota \sigma \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \in \sigma \theta \in$ are not found in some MSS., (almost entirely of the Alexandrian recension) Versions and Fathers. and are rejected by Grot. and Mill, and cancelled by Griesb. and Fritz. But the reasons for this are insufficient, and the scope of the passage and the authority of the parallel one in Mark alike require that they should be retained, as is done by Wets., Matth., and Scholz.
 times supplied. See Bos Ell. p. 95. So the Latin nom est meum.
 mentators and Translators, misled by the antient Versions, here supposed an ellipse of döทंबecat, which affords some colour to the Arian and Socinian doctrines. It is, however, sufficient, so far as the present passage is concerned, to say, (with Grot., and some of the best Commentators, as Koecher, Kypke, Gatak., and Kuin.,) that $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$, when, as in this place, it is not followed by a verb, but by a noun or pronoun, is equivalent to $\epsilon l \mu \eta \eta^{\prime}$, except , or unless. Thus the $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ in Mark ix. 8 , is by Matth. xvii. 8 , expressed by el $\mu$ j. See also the examples from Callimach., Demosth., and Herodot., adduced by the Commentators. The passage, then, is well paraphrased by Bp. Horsley, cited by Rose ap. Parkh. p. 33. -I cannot arbitrarily give happiness, but must bestow it on those alone for whom, in reward of holiness and obedience, it is prepared, according to God's just decrees.
25.oid $\rho$ P Rosenm., and Fritz. take the катак. and кaтє\}. to denote tyrannical und arbitrary pouer, of course hinting a censure thereon; in which sense the words do occur in the Sept. But as it is scarcely to be supposed that the governors in question were always tyrants, and as the simple verbs are used in Luke, it is better, with many good Commentators, to suppose the sense to be.


## 










1 Pet．1． 19.
＇exercise authority over．＇Thus the кatà is not so much intensive，as it promotes definiteness． The Commentators thus adverted to，with even Less reason，suppose the first au่Tî̀ to refer to the people，the second to the kings；which is harsh，and inconsistent with the parallel pas－ sage in Luke．There is，in fact，a repetition of the same sentiment in different words，（as also at ver．27．）for greater emphasis．See Bp．Jebb＇s Sacr．Lit．p． 228 ．seqq．；unless we take（as I have suggested in Recens．Syn．）ajpxoutcs to denote kings，princes；and ol Meyailot，the great ones who govern under them．
26．84］This is omitted in very many MSS．， some Versions，and Theophyl．，and is can－ celled by Griesb．，Knapp，Tittm．，Vat．，and Scholz．；but restored by Fritz．，and，I think， rightly；for，it is supported not only by high authority here and in Mark，but is so suitable to the passage，that it can hardly be dispensed with．
 ference between these terms，the former signify－ ing a servant，like our footman or valet，and usually a free man；the latter，a servant for whatever work，and also a slave．Some Com－ mentators think that there is here a gradation intended．
 the ransom paid for any one＇s deliverance from death or captivity，or other evil；and that both in the Scriptural and Classical writers，in the former of whom it denotes the hostia piacularis； and so，（ as has been proved by Le Clerc，Whitby， Kypke，and Kuin．）it must here be taken．Thus Schleus．，who explains：＂ut morte suà homines a peccati vi et poenis liberaret．＂We must un－ derstand Christ to have said that he undergoes death as a piacular victim．（ $1 \mathrm{Tim} . \mathrm{ii} .6$ ．）He
 for all．Other Jewish and Heathen writers （Whitby remarks）have the like expressions，as Josh．ii．14．60．$\dot{\eta}^{\prime} \psi v X \eta \eta_{\eta}^{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\nu} \dot{a}^{\prime} \nu \theta^{\prime} \dot{v} \mu \omega \bar{\nu} \nu$. See Outram．de Sacrif．1． 22 ．As to the offering of vicarious sacrifices，Le Clerc and others have shown that the Gentiles as well as the Jews were generally persuaded that piacular victims were accepted by the Deity as an atonement for the life of an offender．Such persons were termed civrifuxoi．See more in Recens．Synop．The sense therefore（as Fritz．，notwithstanding his Neologian bias，frankly acknowledges）is，that our Lord was to give up his life as a ransom for the lives of，\＆cc．，that they might not suffer spiritual death．So Abp．Magee，（who is carefully to be
consulted at Vol．I．pp．222．238．357．464．and 472．）observes，＂that our Lord speaks of his own death in the same sacrificial terms，that had been applied to the sin－offerings of old．And the force of the expressions $\lambda u ́ r \rho o y$ and avtìuvpov， as conveying the idea of vicarious substitution，is fully established，when applied in the New Testament to the death of Christ，which is ex－ pressly said to be a sacrifice for the sins of men， and is that true and substantial sacrifice which those of the law but faintly and imperfectly re－ presented．＂It is clear，then，how utterly un－ founded is the sense assigned by those who deny the doctrine of vicarious sacrifice，＇one ransom instead of many ransoms ；＇an interpretation ex－ ceedingly forced and strained，and such as de－ served not to have been countenanced by any real scholar．

There is more cause of doubt as to the sense of ro $\lambda \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$ ，which seeming to imply that redemption is not universal，has perplexed serious，but un－ lettered Christians．To avoid this difficulty， some would take mo八入क्̀ of believers only．But the best interpreters，antient and modern，are nearly all agreed that it must be taken for $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ Toov；a sense which is thought to bear in many passages，especially Matth．xxvi．28．Mark x． 45 ；xiv．24．Rom．viii．29．Heb．ix．28．Such a method，however，seems to be too bold，when a doctrine is concerned．I have，in Recens．Syn． endeavoured to show that this use of mo入入ol for тávтes has no place in Scripture，nor perhaps in the Classical writers．The true ratio of the thing I have stated as follows：＂There is in rod入ol a tacit opposition to，or comparison with，some smaller number，（whether one or two）usually expressed，but sometimes understood．Now when that number happens to be only one，or very few， the difference between them is so great that $\pi 0 \lambda$－ dol may，in a popular sense，denote mávтes，be－ ing，as it were，all ；though，in such cases，it may be more correctly rendered very many．This sense I would，therefore，with several eminent Commentators，as Grotius，Calvin，Luc．13rug．， Maldonat，Fritz．，and some others，adopt in the present passage，rendering＇very many，＇namely， those who should believe in Christ unto obedi－ ence．＇And so in Matth．xxvi．28．Mark x． 45. and xiv．24．The other examples adduced are not applicable；though there is in most of these cases the tacit comparison above mentioned；in others xod入ol has the Article，and signifies the rest of any number from which some small part has been taken．The signification here cannot be，as some imagine，＇the many ；＇for that would require the Article．
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30. dóo тuф $\lambda o l, \& c$.] The minute discrepancies in this narrative, compared with those of Mark and Luke, involve no contradiction, since, though those Evangelists mentioned one blind man as healed, yet they do not say that only one was healed; and Mark and Luke in mentioning one, meant to point out that one who was the more known. Again, the apparent difference between Matthew and Mark, as compared with Luke, with regard to the place where the miracle was performed, may, it is thought, be removed by reading in Luke ' when, or while, Jesus was near Jericho.' If, however, the trifling discrepancies adverted to were really irreconcilable, still they would not affect the credit of the Evangelists, being such as are found in the best historians; nay, they may be rather thought to strengthen it.
 that;' as in a kindred passage at xii. 16. dexeti$\mu \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ à்тoīs ${ }^{2} \nu a \mu \eta$ i, \&c.
34. $\alpha \nu \in \beta \lambda \epsilon \psi a \nu$ aitcẽv oi $\dot{\delta} \phi 0$.] 'their eyes recovered sight.'
XXI. 1. cis $\mathrm{B}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}} \theta$ фa $\left.\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\eta}\right]$ Mark xi. 1. adds kul $\mathrm{B} \eta \theta a \nu i a \nu$. We may therefore suppose that the territories of the two villages were contiguous. The name of the former denotes the place of figs; that of the latter, the place of palm fruit.
2. Triv dтévavtı] Mark has $\varepsilon \xi$ èvavtias.

- $\pi \bar{\omega} \lambda \frac{1}{2}$ ] 'a colt.' Mark and Luke add, "on which no man had ever sat." Animals which had never borne the yoke, or been employed for ordinary purposes, were (by a custom common to all the antients, whether Hebrews or Gentiles) employed for sacred uses.

See Deut. xxi. 3. 1 Sam. vi. 7. Horat. Epod. 9. 22. Ovid Met. 3. 11. Virg. Georg. 4. 540. 551. Mark and Luke mention the sending for the colt only, as being that whereon alone our Lord rode; not mentioning the ass, though also brought, agreeable to the prophecy of Zecharias, because they do not mention that prophecy. There is plainly in the latter representation no negation of the former. Whitby notices the minuteness of the matters predicted, and rightly infers Christ's supernatural prescience.

- el $\left.{ }^{2} \eta \tau l,\right]$ A popular mode of expression equivalent to, '] if he shall make objection.'

3. $\delta$ кúpoos] i. e. not 'the Lord,' which involves great improbability, (see Dodd.) but 'the master,' as at vii. 21. and viii. 25. Joh. xi. 12. xiii. 13. and 14. See Campb. and Schleusn.
 ones) Versions, and Fathers, have $\dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \varepsilon \lambda \lambda e \bar{T}$, which is preferred by Mill and Wets., and edited by Matth., Griesb., Knapp., Tittm., and Scholz., but without reason. In so minute a variation manuscript jauthority is of little weight; and yet there is far more of that for the old reading than for the new one, which cannot be admitted, as violating the norma loquendi; for the Present cannot (as Kuin. imagines) be here taken for the Future. The common reading is rightly defended by Scholz. (who observes that the new reading arose from an error of pronunciation) and restored to the text by Fritz.
 poetical personfication usual in the prophetical writings. Jerusalem might be called the daughter of Sion, being situated at the foot, and, as it were, under the wing of that fortified mount.
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－ixto乌uyiou．］scil．ктฑivous．The word pro－ perly signifies any beast of burden．（See my note on Thucyd．ii．3．）But as the ass was com－ monly used，it here denotes a pack－ass．

7．dтeкádıбev］The reading here is not a little controverted．＇Exexídiaยy was the reading of all the early Edd．；which was altered by the Elzevir Editor，from several MSS．to ḋтexátioav． But the former has been restored by Wets．， Matth．，Knapp．，Griesb．，Tittm．，Fritz．，and Scholy．The authority，however，of the latter is superior to that of the former，（though it must be confessed that in so small a variation MSS．are of little weight）；and it is supported by Luke \＆Teßißaбay．It is also preferred by several Commentators，as Beza，Camerar．，Pisc．，Wakef．， and Schleus．：and if we were to follow the pro－ prietas lingua，it ought to be adopted．Yet as the verb is often in the Sept．used in the sense ＇to ride＇or＇to sit，＇so the reading $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \in \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \theta_{\imath} \sigma \in \nu$ seems to deserve the preference，especially as it is supported by the parallel passage in Mark． Thus，though there is a minute diversity in Mat－ thew and Mark as compared with Luke，yet it is no real discrepancy，since it does not involve any contradiction．The whole truth is，that they spread their garment as a saddle on the colt，and Jesus sat thereon，placed in his seat，in token of reverence，by the attendant multitude．As to the aiveiv，it must not，with many Commentators， be taken，per enallagen，as plural for singular； or $\tau$ cyds be supplied，with others；（both me－ thods being founded on unsound principles）but， with Euthym．，Theophyl．，Beza，Hombergh， Schleus．，Wahl．，and Fritz．，the aivēिv must be referred to the clothes．
8．$\dot{\delta}$ тлєiotos $\delta$ ox 0 os］＇the bulk of the peo－ ple，＇consisting of those going to keep the pass－ over，and of those who，after Lazarus＇s resur－ rection，had come out of the city to meet Christ． See John xii． 9 ．
 custom employed on the public entry of kings，
yet in use also among the Greeks．See the ex－ amples in Recens．Synop．
 joy，employed at the feast of tabernacles and other public rejoicings among the Jews．Yet the custom was in use also among the Greeks and Romans．
 beseech thee，from Ps．cxvii． 25.

－$\delta$ E $\rho$ रópevos］A title of the Messiah，like viòs $\Delta$ autd．
－Qoavyà d̀ roîs ífiorous！］Kuin．thinks there is an ellipse of $\dot{\delta} \dot{\omega}$ ；and Grot．takes the
 it is better，with others，to supply $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \sigma t$ ，taking it as a periphrasis for E．v oiv ounois．Thus in $^{2}$ Heb．i．3．and viii．1．év i$\psi \eta \lambda$ ois is interchanged with è oupavois．As to the ellipse after＇$\Omega \sigma a \nu$－
 a noun．Thus Fritz．well renders，＇eadem lax－ tantium gratulatio in calo obtineat．＇

10．$\dot{e} \sigma \in i \sigma \theta_{\eta}$ ］＇was in commotion，＇or agita－ tion；not through fear，but at the novelty of the sight．
11．$\delta \boldsymbol{\pi} \rho \circ \phi \eta^{\prime} \tau \eta s$, ］The force of the Article is， ＇he who is acoounted a prophet．＇
12．To lepòv］．A general name for the whole edifice，with all its courts，as distinguished from the עad̀s or temple properly so called，which comprehended only the vestibule，the sanctuary， and the holy of holies．
－$\left.{ }^{\prime} \xi \in \dot{\epsilon} \beta \pi{ }^{\prime} \lambda e-i \epsilon \rho \bar{\omega},\right]$ It appears from Mark xi．11．that Jesus did not do this on the day of his entry into Jerusalem（though it is there said that he entered into the temple，and looked round the whole of it，）but the day after；spending the night at Bethany，and returning to Jerusalem in the morning，and in the way thither working the miracle of the fig－tree．As Mark is so posi－ tive and particular in his account，and as laath． does by no means expressly connect our Lord＇s driving out the traders with the events of the day，
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(though Doddr. represents it so) we ought, it should seem, to adopt St. Mark's account. To do which, there cannot be a greater inducement than the consideration that those who adopt the other hypothesis are compelled (as Doddr. and Weston) to suppose that the circumstancesin question happened twice on two successive days. Nay, thrice; for our Lord had done much the same thing in the first year of his ministry (Joh. ii. 14.) The reason why he did not then do it is suggested
 because the buyers and sellers had most of them retired. That it should then be evening was likely enough, considering the events of the day, which must have occupied a considerable time.

- ко $\lambda \lambda \nu \beta \iota \sigma \sigma \bar{\omega} \nu]$ The word, from к $\lambda \lambda \lambda \nu \beta o s$, a petty coin, signifies those who exchanged foreign coin into Jewish, or the larger into the smaller coin, for the convenience of the purchasers of the commodities sold in the temple.

13. $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$.] Not literally thieves, but extortioners and cheats, at least persons devoted to base lucre. An interpretation which seems require by the expression of John oiks $\frac{\varepsilon}{} \mu \pi \circ \rho!{ }^{2}$ Though our Lord's assertion might be justified in its full sense by a reference to Joseph. B. J. v.9, 4. Bp. Smalbroke supposes that in this expression there is an allusion to the custom of the Jewish robbers, of sheltering themselves in those caves which abound in Judea; though indeed the same custom prevailed in most parts of the antient world; of which the story of Cacos (called by Propertius, raptor ab untro) is an illustration.
14. $\pi \rho o \sigma \hat{\eta} \lambda$ Aol $a \dot{u} \tau \dot{\varphi}]$ 'had recourse to him, for assistance.'
15. ti өaumácal The word has here a conjoint sense of miraculous. So in Ecclus. xlviii. 15.
 there is added exegeticè $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \tau a$.
16. èк $\sigma$ óópaтos-aivov;] An application to the present case of a passage of $\mathrm{Ps}_{\text {s }}$. viii. 2. Sept. (speaking of the existence and providence of God, so clearly appearing from the works of nature, that even the most simple must see)
where the Hebrew is rendered 'thou last ordained strength;' the Sept. ' thou hast perfected praise,' i. e. accomplished a grand effect by weak means; for the divine praise is perfected even by the silence of the suckling, and the artless cry of the babe. Thus there is no real discrefancy in sentiment, though there be a diversity in expression, between the Hebr. and the Sept. That the whole Psalm has a prophetic reference to the Messiah, is plain by there being three other passages in the New Testament where it is applied to him. Өŋ入á\}ect is used both in the active and the neuter, in the sense to suckle or to suck.
17. मiv入ioon $\eta$ enki.] lodged or spent the night there. Such is the sense here; though the verb often means to abide or stay. Jesus left the city, and returned to Bethany for the night, not so much, we may suppose, to avoid the snares that might be laid for his life, as to avoid all suspicion of affecting temporal power; the night being adapted to excite popular commotion.
 day of the week Jesus had made his solemn entry into Jerusalem, and had returned in the evening to Bethany. On the second, he drove out the money changers, and in the evening again retired thither. On the third he returned into the city, taught in it. and held all those discourses which we read in Luke xx. Mark xi. -xiii. Math. xxi. xxiii.6. As to the cursing of the figtree, related by Matthew and Mark, Matthew narrating the thing more briefly, mentions it as being at once cursed and withered. But Mark, detailing the matter more circumstantially and exactly, says that Jesus had pronounced this curse early in the morning of the day on which he drove the traders out of the Temple, (xi. 12.) that on the morning of the following day the Apostles had perceived that the tree was withered, (ver. 20.) Therefore Mark says that it was withered, when this really took place, or else when it was observed by the Apostles that the tree on which Jesus had the day before pronounced the curse was withered. (Kain.)
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19．Mriкert－al⿳亠䒑⿻二丨a．］This was emblematical and figurative，according to the usual custom of the sages of the East to express things by symbolical actions．It was also prophetic．Our Lord intended to prove that his power to punish the disobedient was as great as that to confer benefits；and also to prefigure the destruction of the perverse Jews，because in the time of fruits they had borne none，（see ver．33．－41；）more－ over to read a very important lesson to all his disciples of every age，that if the opportunities God gives for the approving themselves virtuous be peglected，nought will remain but to be with－ ered by the fiat which shall consign them to everlasting destruction．
21．кal $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ठıакрı $\theta \bar{\eta} \tau e$,$] Kuin．observes that$ this negative expression is the very same with the positive dav exnre $\pi / \sigma \pi \iota \nu$ ，the two being united for the sate of emphasis，as at xiii． 34. and elsewhere．In diakp．in this sense（to hesi－ tate）there is the same metaphor as in dovTáco and the Latin diffido．
 as an elliptical expression；and most think it is for Td тepl тins $\sigma u n \hat{y} s$ yevóvos ápyov．But Fritz．denies that there is any ellipse；maintain－

 reference，it is supposed，to the Mount of Olives． Luke for mountain says sycamore tree．But there is，in fact，no discrepancy ；because Jesus might， and，no doubt，did make use of both．On the force of which adagial sayings see Note on Matt．xvii．20．Fritz．remarks that the con－ struction of this passage is：$\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ кal yevijeetat，

 Genitives of consequence．
 they were privileged to ask，because they had the power of inquiring into the pretensions of a prophet；nay since the authority of preaching in the temple was derived from them．The inter－ rogators expected，no doubt，that he would answer，＇By virtue of my right as Messiah，＇and thus enable them to fix on him the charge of blasphemy．But Jesus forbears to directly answer his malevolent interrogators，not through fear，as appears from the boldness evinced in the parables immediately following ；but，according to a method familiar to Hebrew，nay to Grecian， disputants，（see the citations of Schoettgen and Wets．）answers question by question，and that propounded with consummate wisdom；for while the Pharisees were not disposed，nay were even afraid to dispute John to be a prophet，they would thereby，on their own principles，admit the claims of Jesus，to whose divine mission John had borne repeated and unequivocal testimony．
25．тd $\beta \alpha \pi \tau \iota \sigma \mu \alpha$－iँ ；］Campb．renders， ＇whence had John authority to baptize？＇Bdжж－ Tto $\mu a$ is put，by synecdoche，for the whole ministry of John to preach repentance，and the doctrines he taught，because baptism was its most prominent feature，being a symbol of the purity which he enjoined．
－${ }^{〔} \xi$ oúpayoū，$]$ for $\dot{i \kappa} \Theta \in e o u ̄$ ；a use which sometimes occurs in the LXX．，but rarely in the Classical writers．Indeed Fritz．contends that $\mathfrak{\xi} \xi$ oupavoū should be taken for oujpdyıov，＇of heavenly origin．＇
－deari où oúk $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \pi}$ ．a．］＇why then have ye not believed，why do ye not believe him，＇namely， in his testimony of me．
26．фoßoíme 0 a］This is not，（as Kuin．and other Philologists suppose，）a middle verb signi－
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fying to terrify oneself, but a deponent, formed from what had originally a passive force. Fritz. justly remarks on that brachylogia in the present passage, by which a clause is omitted after $\dot{c} \xi$ $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \omega \nu$, (equivalent to "that will not be for our good,") to which the $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ following refers, and which $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is put for two $\gamma a \rho$ 's. Perhaps we should write $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \in \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu$-per aposiopesin.
- 'xover] 'account.' Perhaps a Latinism.
- ws $\left.\pi \rho o \phi \gamma_{i} \tau \eta \nu.\right]$ The wis is wrongly taken by Kuin. and others as put for övtws; though $\partial \nu \tau \omega s$ is found in the parallel passage of Mark. The wis is either elegantly pleonastic, (by which the expression will be equivalent to that of Luke) or somewhat diminishes the force of the assertion.

27. oùk oizaцey.] Hence (says Wets.) Jesus rightly infers their unfitness to be judges in this matter, or to claim to have their authority reverenced.
 me your opinion as to what I am about to say.' It seems to have been a common form of speech.
 meant God; but it is not so clear what is meant by the técua dúo, on which there has been some diversity of opinion. The best Commentators, however, are agreed that the words designate the two different classes of the Jewish nation; 1. the profane and irreligious generally, but who were brought to repentance by John, and to reformation by Christ; 2. the Scribes and Pharises, whether priests, or laymen, who, though professedly anxious to do the will of God, were in reality the greatest enemies to religion, and especially that of the Gospel. See more in Macknight.
28. deutépew] Many MSS., some of them very antient, as also some Versions and Fathers have èrépe, which was approved by Mill and Bengel, and adopted by Wets., Griesb., Knapp, Tittm.,

Vater, and Scholz. But Matth. and Fritz. retain the common reading; and rightly; for it is supported by greater authority, and the other reading is pretty plainly a correction. The two words, moreover, are often confounded a remarkable example of which occurs in Thucyd. iii. 49.

- $\dot{\epsilon} \gamma \omega^{\circ} \kappa \dot{u} \rho \iota e^{\cdot}$ ] The best Commentators are agreed that this answers to the Heb. הנני, which is, by ellipse, a phrase of responsive assent, rendered by the LXX. İov tyci. So in 1 Sam.iii. 4. Numb. xiv. 14. See also Luke i. 38. and Acts ix. 10. "The Hebrews (observe Vatab., Erasm., and Brug.) answer by pronouns, where the Latins use verbs and adverbs, as etiam Domine." It may be paralleled by our own idiom "aye, sir." Indeed our aye and the eja, ju or ya, seem to be cognate with d $\gamma \dot{\omega}$. Certanly ${ }^{\ell} \gamma \omega \omega^{\prime}$, or rather ${ }^{\text {E/ }} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega \gamma \epsilon$, perpetually occurs in this sense in the Classical writers.

31. ol $\tau \in \lambda \bar{\omega} \nu a t$ кal al пó $\rho$ yat $]$ i. e. even the worst of those profane and dissolute persons. Hpoáyourt. Glass explains this 'lead on;' and Schleus. and Wahl assign yet less admissible senses. There seems no reason to abandon the common interpretation 'go before,' or precede. In this sense it was understood by the antients. The present may be taken for the future.
 usual in Scripture, for, 'he came to you in the practice of, i. e. practising, righteousness. Or it may be taken, with others, for $\delta \delta \eta \gamma \omega \bar{\omega}$ els


- toù $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon \bar{v} \sigma a l a u ̀ \tau \omega ̄ \cdot]$ This seems to be put


33. $\tau$ ss] This is not found in several of the best MSS. and some Versions and Fathers, and was cancelled by Griesb., Knapp, Vat., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. It is, however, retained by Matth. and Wets.; but, if we may judge from supra ver. 28., without reason. Nay, as Fritz.
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suggests，even the construction requires its absence．
33．$\dot{\infty} \rho \nu \xi \in \nu-\lambda \eta \nu \partial \nu$,$] The \lambda_{\eta \nu o \delta s}$ properly de－ noted the large vat（called the wine－press）into which the grapes were thrown，to be expressed； in which sense it often occurs in the LXX．But as this vessel had connected with it on the side （hence sometimes called $\pi \rho o \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu i o v)$ ，or under it（to check，by the coolness of the situation，too great fermentation）a cistern，into which the expressed juice flowed；so，by synecdoche， ג yo came to denote（as here）that vat ；which， as it was necessarily subterranean，and sometimes under the vat，so it was often called úxo入n＇viov， as we see in Mark and Is．xvi．10．These cis－ terns，which are even yet in use in the East，bore some resemblance to the $\lambda$ d́ккоь of the Greeks， which the Scholiast on Aristoph．Ell．I54．（cited by Wets．）explains cal boúy $\mu a \tau \alpha$ eu $\dot{u} \chi \propto \rho a$ ， каl отроүүú入a тетрáy wa，（I conjecture каl
 terranean cavities，sometimes round，and some－ times square；plastered and mortared，for the reception of oil or wine．
－rópyov，］Namely，partly as a place of abode to the proprietor or occupier，while the produce was collecting；and partly for safeguard to the servants stationed there as guards over the place．Grot．observes that in the application of the parable these circumstances are to be consi－ deed as serving for ornament，and are not to be dwelt on，since they only express generally that every thing was provided both for pleasure and defence．「ccopyois．The word often denotes， as here，the occupier of any estate，as distinguished from the proprietor．
 ing the fruit．＇
 tain portion of them．Rent was then（as it is to
this day in many parts of the East）paid in kind．

35．er dec $\rho a \nu$ ，］Dépect signifies properly to flay or skin；but as words signifying great violence come at length，through abuse，to bear a milder sense， it was at length used to signify beat severely．
 reverence．${ }^{\text {＇}}$＇$\nu \tau \rho$ éneorat signifies 1．to turn upon oneself；2．ex adjuncto，to be afraid；3．to regard with reverence．Grot．remarks that the expression is to be understood $\theta$ corner $\bar{\omega}$ s，not to exclude prescience，but to denote that the contingency of an event is viewed in its causes．

41．какойs какс̄̄s $\alpha \pi$ ．］Camp．renders，＇he will bring these wretches to a wretched death．＇ This phrase，in which the Paronomasia is re－ markable，occurs very frequently in the Greek writers from Homer downwards．It is worthy of observation that by Luke the words are ascribed to Christ himself，and draw from the scribes the exclamation $\mu \eta$ ク＇ devised for removing this apparent discrepancy the best seems to be that of Doddr．，who sup－ poses that Christ in the first instance drew their own condemnation from the Sanhedrim，and then soon afterwards repeated their words，by way of confirmation．There is nothing to stum－ ble at in the Priests pronouncing their own de－ struction，since they seem not to have understood Christ＇s drift in the parable．
 antient mode of paying rent（which term sig－ nifies what is rendered for occupancy）namely， by rendering a certain proportion of the produce． Of which I have adduced several examples with illustrations in Recens．Synop．The most appo－ site to the present purpose is Plato de Legs． 8.

 єклєкто！．
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most dense and extreme，as being the furthest removed from the light of the banquet．

14．то八入оl－iклектоi．］See the long and able annotation of Hammond in Recens．Synop．，and a fine observation of Theophyl．cited by Park－ hurst，Lex．v．èк入eктós．

15．тayideúcwocty］＇that they might ensnare him．＇The term is properly used of snaring birds ；but，like dypeúctv employed by Mark xii． 12．and the Latin irretire，and illaqueare，is used of plotting any one＇s destruction．
 of these in the New Testament，and the silence of Josephus，nothing certain with respect to them can be determined；but the prevailing and best－ founded opinion seems to be，that they did not form any distinct religious sect，（though probably Sadducees in opinion，as was Herod，）but were rather a political party，or club，composed of the courtiers，ministers，domestics，and partisans and adherents generally of Herod．This opinion is confirmed by the termination of the word cavos， which was in that age appropriated to denoting political partisans，such as Casariani，Pompeiani， Ciceroniani，\＆c．See more in Horne＇s Introd． Vol． $111.183,184,380$.
$\left.-d \lambda_{\eta} \theta \eta_{s}\right]$＇upright，＇neither practising simu－ lation nor dissimulation．

 $\sigma \omega \pi o \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta$ ．（of which the former is a Greek phrase，the latter a Hebraism）are thought to be of the same sense．But Fritz．，with others，denies this，and lays down the connexion as follows： ＇tu per neminem a veritate te abduci sinis； neque enim homines curas，quos si curares，a vera via facile aberrares，sed Deum．＇Thus he thinks that ж $\rho$ ó corov div $\theta \rho$ ．is put，by an unusual circumlocution，for $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \boldsymbol{\pi}$ ous．To this，how－ ever，I cannot assent；for the т $\rho \delta \sigma$ ．adverts to the external condition of men，with allusion to
its being no more a part of the man than the ж $\rho$ ó $\sigma \omega \pi$ ，or actor＇s mask．
18．тovppiav］This signifies，like the Latin malitia，craft．The other Evangelists use the more definite terms mavoupriav and úxóк－ $\rho เ \sigma เ \nu$.

19．тd עó $\mu \iota \sigma \mu a$ тoû кरivaov．］nummum ex eo genere quo census exigi solebat．（Fritz．）
20．tivos－txtypaфウं）＂Our Lord（says Dr． Hales，Chron．III．174．）baffles the malignant proposers of the question，by taking advantage of their own concession，that the denarius bore the emperor＇s image and superscription，and also of the determination of their own schools，that wherever any king＇s coin was current，it was a proof of that country＇s subjection to that govern－ ment．He significantly warns these turbulent and seditious demagogues，the Pharisees，to render unto Casar the dues of Casar，which they resisted；and these licentious and irreligious courtiers，the Herodians，to render unto God the dues of God，which they neglected；thus pub－ licly reproving both，but obliquely，in a way that they could not take any hold of．＂
 youar＇＇IovóaLás éa入 cokutas．＂Though（says Whitby）the question as to the right of Cæesar to demand tribute of the Jews may seem to be undecided by the answer，yet the precept at ver．22．is decisive，and being united with the preceding verses by oūy，it inculcates that duty of submission to established governments which is a leading feature of the Christian religion．＂ Thus the duties both of civil and religious obe－ dience are sanctioned．

23．$\mu \dot{\left.\text { in elvai } \alpha^{\prime} \nu \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \iota \nu,\right] ~ C a m p b . ~ i n ~ a ~ l o n g ~}$ and able annotation maintains that the sense is，＇there is no future life．＇He shows that the Sadducees denied not merely the resurrection of the body，but the immortality of the soul，and a future state of retribution．＂They had（he adds）
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no notion of spirit，and were consequently obliged to make use of terms which properly relate to the body，when they spoke of a future state；which therefore came at length to be denoted simply by the word resurrection．＂
 children．＇＇Extyaцßpévoct．This word（which occurs also in the Sept．）denotes to marry a widow by right of affinity．
－$\sigma \pi \in ́ \rho \mu a]$ This word，like the Heb．yer， denotes offspring or progeny，whether one or more children ；though in Scripture it is almost confined to the latter．On the contrary in the Classical writers it is generally used of the former．So Soph．El．1510．\＆Ed．Tyr． 1087. and a Delphic oracle in Thucyd．v．16．bids
 are，however，examples in the Classical writers of бжं́pнa in a plural sense．Thus Soph． Tach．304．Eurip．Med．798．d入入à ктaveĩy

29．т $\lambda a v a ̈ \sigma \theta e-\Theta e o u ̄.] ~ i . ~ e . ~ y e ~ d e c e i v e ~ y o u r-~$ selves by assuming a false hypothesis，and by your ignorance of the true sense of the Scrip－ tares；not considering the omnipotence of God， to whom renewal of existence can require no more exertion of power than original creation； nor reflecting that God is able to raise up the dead without their former passions．By t as ypaфcis is meant chiefly，but not entirely，the Pentateuch．
30．ойтe iкyapifovtat， 1 On this question there has been much difference of opinion among the Jewish Rabbis．The more recent
of them maintain the affirmative ；the earlier ones the negative．See a fine extract from Maimonid． in Recent．Synop．
 similarity must，however，by the context be limited to the point in question，i．e．in not being subject to the appetites of the body，and perhaps in immortality．It does not therefore follow that because angels are，as is supposed，composed of spirit only，that the spirits of just men made perfect shall have spirits only．That they will also have bodies of some sort or other，is certain from 1 Cor．xvi．42．sq．，which passage also describes those bodies，though，as might be ex－ pected，too obscurely to be understood by us in our present state．

32．Beds＇A ipa $\mu$ ，］i．e．the God and patron， benefactor，of Abraham；for God is said to be the God of any one，inasmuch as he confers benefits on him．See Doddr．Kuin．remarks on the manner of argumentation here pursued， so agreeable to the usual method of the Jewish doctors，who used to slightly allude to passages of Scripture，and left their auditors to find the consequence of any proposition，omitting，in ar－ gumentation，the transitions and conclusions，the uses and applications．

35．тeıpáYcov aútd̀］Some modern Inter－ praters assign to $\pi e c \rho a \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ the good sense，explo－ rams，trying，viz．his skill in Scripture；which seems to be countenanced by Mark．But most adopt the bad one，tempting；and there seems no sufficient reason for abandoning the common interpretation．The truth seems to be（as Chrys．
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and Theophyl．suppose）that the man came with an evil intention，but departed better disposed towards Christ．
36．тоía èvто入ท $\mu \varepsilon \gamma^{\prime} \lambda \eta$ ］Here maia is for cis；and $\mu$ e $\gamma \lambda^{\lambda} \eta$ for $\mu \in \gamma \leftarrow \sigma T \eta$ ，by Hebraism；on which account it has the privilege of a superlative， in dispensing with the Article．Superlatives do so，from the affinity which they bear to ordinals． See Middles．Gr．Art．vi．§ 3 \＆4．But to turn from words to things，the question involved a matter of controversy among the Jewish Doctors as to the preference or importance of different precepts；some maintaining the pre－eminence of one，some of another．Only while they dis－ tinguished the Divine precepts into great and small，they constantly gave the preference to the ceremonial ones．Christ，however，decided in favour of the moral law，yet not to the neglect of the ceremonial．
37．$\ddot{\epsilon} \phi \eta\rceil$ This reading is preferred by Mill and Bengel ；and is edited by Math．，Griesb．， Knapp，Tittm．，Vat．，and Scholz，for the common one elmer；and that on the authority of nearly all the best and a great part of the MSS．， together with the Ed．Prin．confirmed by some Fathers．
 nearly equivalent，and united for intensity of sense．The construction is Hebraic，for $\varepsilon \kappa$ with the Genit．，which is not unfrequently found with one or other of the above nouns．They are very rarely united；yet one example is adduced by Wets．from Philo．
 in degree ；springing out of it and closely con－ netted with it．Tiv $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma i o \nu$, i．e．every person with whom we have to do．Comp．Rom．xiii． 8. And $\dot{\alpha} y a \pi d \dot{d}$ signifies to exercise love or charity towards．＇Is reautáy．We are not commanded to love or benefit our fellow creatures as much as ourselves，because that would have been incon－ sistent with the principle of self－love which the Almighty has implanted in us，for our proser－ vation．For the wis（like the Heb．z）imports not equality in degree，but similarity in kind． Thus the precept corresponds to that of our Lord at Math．vii．12．See Whitby and Dodder．

40．èv taúvaıs кр́́qaขтat．］This is generally
thought to be a metaphor taken from the custom of suspending the tables of the laws from a nail or peg．But the metaphor is common both to the Hebrew，Greek，and Latin，（nay almost all languages）as used of things closely connected and springing from the same origin．There is， however，a Hebraism in the use of $\bar{\epsilon}$ for $\overline{e x}$ ．Or the $\delta \nu$ should have been followed by dvaxeф $\alpha-$入atoüvtal，or $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o u ̈ y \tau a \iota$ ，as in Rom．xiii． 9. Fritz．well explains the sense thus：＇in hoc utroque precepto omnium，que in V．T．le－ guntur，legum cardo vertitur．
 in the parallel passage of Mark．This is plainly the sense，notwithstanding the attempts of some recent Commentators to explain it away；and such it is acknowledged to be by Fritz．Indeed the writers of the Old Testament are always sup－ posed by our Lord to have written under the inspiration，more or less plenary，of the Holy Spirit．
－Kúpıov］＂This word，（says Campo．）cor－ responding with the Hebr．אדון，aton，signifying Lord or Master，was a term implying an acknow－ ledgment of superiority in the person to whom it was addressed，and therefore never given to info－ riors，though sometimes，perhaps，out of courtesy， to equals．Upon this，then，our Lord＇s argument turns．An independent monarch，such as David， acknowledged no Lord or Master but God；far less would he bestow that title upon a son，or descendant；and consequently the Messiah，being so called by him，under the influence of the Spirit，and therefore acknowledged as his sue－ rior，must be Divine．＂
 kings，on whose right hand sat the heir，or he who was next in dignity，and on the left hand he that was immediately below him in rank．But sitting on the right implied also a participation in the regal power and authority．Hence ovum $\beta$ a－ $\sigma \iota$ evielv is interpreted by St．Paul， 1 Cor．xv． 25. ßaбь入єúetv．
－z cos $\hat{a} \nu \theta \bar{\omega}]$＇while I make．＇The image is derived from the custom of conquerors putting their foot on the neck of a vanquished enemy，as a mark of subjugation．How the words are to be understood of the Messiah，appears from 1 Cor． $x v$ ．25．sq．
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45. ci oũy-d $\sigma \tau \iota$; ] Some of the best Commontaters here recognise an inversion of construction, as in Mark ii. 23 . But as the sense is the same either way, there is no necessity to resort to any such supposition.
46. cis] 'any one,' namely, of the class of persons whom he had just silenced.' $E \pi \epsilon \rho \infty \tau \bar{\eta} \sigma a \iota$, i.e. to put such sort of captions ensnaring quesions as those above-mentioned.
XXIII. 1. Tóte] i.e. (as Chrys. and Thophil. explain) after he had put the Pharisees and Sadducee to silence. 'E $\lambda$ á $\lambda \eta \sigma e$, addressed.
2. кaӨ́d $\delta a s$ ] This alludes to the sitting possure in which the Jewish doctors always taught. They are here said to sit in Moses' seat, by having succeeded to him in the office of teachers of religion. 'Eкíd tray. This may be taken as put like preterite for present, expressing an action commencing in past time, but extending to present, 'have seated themselves.' But it is better, with Fritz., to suppose the Aorist used in the sense of custom.
3. тávтa-xoєєire•] This must be taken restictively (as in Col. iii. 20. \& 22. Ephes.v. 24.) i.e. all things which they read from the Law and the Prophets, and whatever they taught agreeably thereto. This therefore will not at all countenance the Romish doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope.

- Tnpeiv,] Some Editors cancel this word, which is omitted in 7 MSS., some Versions, and Latin Fathers. But that is very slender testimony ; since Versions are, in a case like this, of little authority; and the MSS. are all of the Alexandrian recension, and such as abound with alterations arising from ill judged fastidiousness. The Editors in question rarely consider the true character of the language of the Gospels, which has much of the wordiness distinguishing the common language of antient, and indeed all times.

4. Seoruevouvt] 'they bind on,' load, as a bundle or bale, on a pack-horse. By these burdens we must understand the traditions of the elders.
 not take upon their own shoulders the burdens they lay on those of others;' not, 'they rigourously exact of others,' as Whitby explains. The former interpretation is confirmed by the very antient gloss which crept into the Alexandrian recension, aùvol $\delta \dot{e} \tau \varphi \bar{\delta} \dot{\partial} \kappa \tau . \alpha$. Here we have a proverbial expression (common both to Greek and Latin writers) to denote 'being indisposed to exert oneself in any labour.'
5. $\pi \lambda \alpha \pi \dot{v} y=0 \sigma t$ ] Christ does not censure the wearing of these or of the fringes, but the doing it ostentatiously, by making them very large. These phylacteries took their rise from a literal instead of a spiritual interpretation of Deut. vi. 8. See their description in Rose's Parkhurst, or Horne's Introd. That these were also, as the Commentators inform us, regarded as amulets, or charms to preserve from evil, may be very true; but when they would hence deduce the name itself, we may hesitate; for the name may quite as well imply that they were thereby reminded to keep the law. See a passage of Plutarch cited by Kypke in oc.
6. $\pi \rho \omega \tau$ ток $\lambda$ „नiav] ' the first seat at banquets.' That was probably at the top of the table, as with us; though among the Greeks and Romans the middle place at a triclinium was the most
 of the seniors and the learned, who sat immediately under and with their backs to the pulpit of the reader, their faces being turned toward the people. 'A $\gamma o \rho a i s$, i.e. the public places of the city.
7. $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{ } \kappa \lambda \eta \theta \bar{\eta} \tau \epsilon]$ 'suffer not yourselves to be called.'
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- $\kappa a \theta \eta \gamma \eta \tau \Gamma \dot{s}$,] There is some doubt as to the reading here. Many of the best Commentators would read $\delta_{i} \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa \alpha \lambda o s$, which is found in several MSS., Versions, and Fathers, but is received by no Editor except Fritz.: doubtless because it would seem a gloss on ка $\theta \eta \gamma$. But $\delta \iota \delta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa$. is so much preferable, from its being more correspondent to the Heb. 9 , and such an offensive repetition is thereby removed, that it can scarcely be doubted but that it is the true reading. ' $O$ Xotorós. This is omitted in several antient MSS. of the Alexandrian recension, and some Versions and Fathers; is rejected by Mill and Beng., cancelled by Griesb. and Fritz., and bracketed by most other Editors. It probably crept in from ver. 10.
 Father.' There is an ellipsis of riva.
 often introduced by our Lord, and indeed a frequent maxim among the Jews, and often occurring in the Classical writers. By Christ, however, it is employed in a spiritual sense, i. e. ' him God will exalt.'
13, 14. These verses are transposed in the textus vulgatus and most of the MSS.; but are placed in the present order in the best MSS. confirmed by several Versions and Fathers. And so the Edit. Prin. and Steph. This order, too, (which presents a better connexion) has been, with reason, approved by all the most eminent Commentators, and restored by Mill, Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Fritz., and Scholz. It is supposed that the order was originally altered by Erasmus, on the authority of the Vulgate; and certainly for the worse. Ver. 13. is omitted in several MSS. of the Alexandrian recension, with some Versions and Latin Fathers. But there is no good ground for rejecting it. It should seem that the text above adopted presents the true reading and order, which was accidentally changed by the eyes of the transcribers being carried from the first oual $\dot{\delta}$ - $\dot{\text { ímoxplitai! }}$ to the second, by which the words öть катебӨiete
$-\kappa \rho\{\mu a$ were omitted, and afterwards inserted either by the scribes, (perceiving their mistake,) or by the correctors, but in the wrong place.
- катeनtiere] The ката is intensive, having the sense 'eat up.' Of this use of erotice examples occur frequently in the Greek Classical writers; and the same is the case with the correspondent terms in Latin and indeed in the modern languages. Olkias, goods, property, as olkos is often used in the Classical writers. Both the above metaphors are found in Hom. Od.
 This was done by various subtle artifices. After making them devotees, they devised various means of laying them under contribution, or caballed with the children to deprive the widow of a portion of her dowry, for some return, either in hand, or in expectation.
- $\pi \rho 0 \phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \in t$ ] 'under a pretext,' namely, of religion ; for it was but a mask to conceal their avarice. Maxpd. To be taken adverbially. Sometimes, it is said, these prayers occupied nine hours a day., Пepıббóтєpov, ' a more extreme punishment.'
 more Classical $\kappa \lambda$ eielv $\dot{\alpha} \pi d$ and $\dot{\alpha} \pi o \kappa \lambda e i e t \nu$. It may be compared with our phrase to shut the door in the face of. The metaphor denotes the hindering men from embracing Christianity, which they effected by misinterpreting the prophecies, and by other methods., Toùs eloepxopévous, 'those who are entering,' i. e. who are disposed to enter.

15. терเส́yєтє— $\xi \eta \rho a ̀ v,] ~ A ~ p r o v e r b i a l ~ e x p r e s-~$ sion frequent both in Greek and Latin, importing the greatest activity and exertion. At $\xi \eta \rho a \nu$ sub. $\gamma \bar{\eta} \nu$. When $\xi_{\eta} \rho d \nu$ occurs in the phrase, $\pi \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\delta o \nu}$ may be supplied, as solum in the Latin expressions siccum, and liquidum. The zeal of the Jews for proselytism was, indeed, proverbial among the Heathens, (See Hor. Sat. i. 4.) insomuch that at length it was forbidden by the Constitutiones Imperatorum.
— vídे $\gamma \in \epsilon \nu \nu \eta s]$ i, e. by Hebraism, ' deserving








of，or doomed to，hell．＇It is strange that Kypke， Rosenm．，and some others，should take $\delta, \tau \lambda$ ．to signify dolosum．The grammatical objection to the common interpretation，on the ground that the word never occurs in the comparative，has no force，for I have in Rec．Syn．adduced two examples．Moreover，di ri óvepov，here and in the other two passages where it occurs，is not an adjective，but an adverb．

16．${ }^{\prime} \nu$ 〕 Heb． $\mathrm{z}, \mathrm{by}$ ．In this and the following verses Christ condemns the subtle distinctions of the Pharisees concerning oaths，and points out the sanctity and obligation of an oath．Ó̇dév tort，＇it is a trifling matter．＇A common by－ perbole．T T $\bar{\omega}$ xpuaç roū vaoū．By this some understand the gold which adorned the Temple； others，the sacred utensils；others again，the money set apart for sacred purposes．As no par－ ticular gold is mentioned，it may be understood of any or all the above．＇Oфeinci，for ódei入érクs dort，＇he is bound to perform his oath．＇
 from common use．＇The money was holy，be－ cause it was subservient to the uses of the temple， and other sacred purposes，like the diva $\eta_{\eta \mu a \tau a}$ among the Greeks，and the donuria among the Romans．（Rosenm．）
21．Hence Jesus shows that all those smaller oaths are of equal force with the greatest ；be－ cause，as no one would think of invoking an inanimate object，so by them must be understood （per metonymiam ）the owner of them．（Rosenm．） Katouxifavet．This is read，for the common катоикойयт！，in the greater part of the MSS．and the Ed．Prin．；and this has been with reason adopted by Beng．：and Wets．，and edited by Math．，Griesb．，Tittm．，Vat．，Fritz．，and Sholz．
23．д̇тодекатоӥте－ки́льขоv，］The Pharisees were scrupulously exact in rendering tithes not only of the fruits of the earth，but even of such insignificant herbs as those here specified，as \＄onoguov，the garden mint，äv $\eta_{\eta} \theta_{\nu}$ ，not anise
（which would be dutoov），but dill；（on which see Dioscor．3，461．）and кúmıעov，cummin，a dis－ agreeably pungent herb，and so little esteemed that it was proverbially employed to express worthlessness．Thus кขucvox poorvis signified a miser，as we say a skin－flint．That the above are only meant as examples of insignificant herbs，is plain from Luke having＂mint and rue，＂with the addition of каl тằ $\lambda$ áरavov．＇Aтоб̇кка－ ievéciv is a word not used by the Classical writers， and only found in the Sept．，where it expresses the Heb．．which signifies both to take tithe and to pay tithe．Our Lord，it must be observed， does not censure them for paying tithes of these herbs，but，after performing these minute ob－ servances，for omitting the weightier matters of the Law．This applies to all the subjects of the woes in this Chapter，as is plain from the words

db $\eta_{i k \alpha \tau \epsilon] ~ ' y e ~ n e g l e c t . ' . ~ T h e ~ w o r d ~ e x p r e s s e s ~}^{\text {a }}$ the Heb．Dr ，often applied to the neglect of Divine precepts．Ta Bapútspa，graviora，the more important injunctions．K $\rho / \sigma \iota y$, éneov，cal тท＜compat＞ᄂ xiбтıv．Render＇justice，charity，（or ha－ manity）and faith，＇or trust in God，as the proper foundation of our love；not fidelity，as some explain ；though that sense may be included． Thus it will be agreeable to Luke＇s $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \boldsymbol{d} \boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{q}^{\alpha} \pi \eta \nu$ $\tau o \tilde{v} \Theta \epsilon o \bar{v}$ ．The passage seems to be taken from Micah vi．8．，and may be compared with Ping． Olymp．13，6，11．and Hor．Od．i．24， 6.
 at，＇（which was a mere typographical blunder of the first Edition of our common Version）but strain out or off．There is an allusion to the custom of the Jews（and indeed the Greeks and Romans）of passing their wines（which in the southern parts might easily receive gnats，and indeed breed insects）through a strainer．See Amos vi．6．The former did it from religious scruples，（the кшivゅч or culex vinarius being unclean）the latter，from cleanliness．The
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ratio significationis arises as follows．The term signifies to pass any liquid through a strainer， （ôopiov．See Dioscor．iii，9．\＆v．82．）to sepa－ rate it from the $\dot{b} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \eta$ ；or material particles，（gnats， or aught else）that they may be passed out and off．With respect to $\kappa \alpha \mu \eta \lambda o \nu$ ，it signifies，not a cable，nor a beetle，（as some would take it）but a camel．To make the opposition as strong as may be，two things are selected as opposite as pos－ sible，the smallest insect，and the largest animal． This sort of expression was in use both with the Jewish and the Grecian writers．Kataxinoytes． This word is used not of liquids only，but also of solids，as here．In the former case it may be rendered to gulp down；in the latter，to bolt doun．
 cation of domestic utensils see Horne＇s lntrod． Vol．mi．p．337．Mápo廿ts is a word found only in the later writers，and signifies a platter，dish， or，as some think，sauce－boat．「＇́ $\mu$ ovaıv．There is here a confounding of the two parts of the comparison，which is not unusual in the best antient writers．Thus．Horace，＂rusticus ex－ pectat dum defluat amnis．＂＂Aóricias．This，for the common reading $\alpha \times \rho a \sigma i a s$ ，is found in the best and the greater part of the MSS．，as also many Versions and Fathers．It is also confirmed by the Edit．Princ．，and is adopted by Wets． and edited by Matth．，Griesb．，Knapp，Tittm．， Fritz．，and Scholz．The internal evidence，too， is as strong as the external；for it comports far better with the character of the Pharisees，who （as Campb．observes）are never accused of in－ temperance，though often of injustice．The com－ mon reading is esteemed by Scholz an Alexan－ drian reading．
 phor is still continued，though the reasoning is carried on according to the thing intended．
27．кекоуเa $\mu$ évocs，］whitened with chalk or lime．The tombs were annually whitewashed， that their situation might be known，and the pollution of touching them avoided．This
whitening extended as far on the surface of the ground as the vault reached under ground．The sense is，that they were so polluted with vice， that they defiled all who had communication with them，and were avoided like sepulchres． In the parallel passage of Luke xi．44．，where they are likened to $\mu \nu \eta \mu$ eĩa áò̀ $\eta \lambda a$ ，（see Note in loc．）there is，in fact，no discrepancy，but reference is had to the contagion they spread around them．＇Aкa日apoias．Very apposite to the present purpose is a passage adduced in Recens．Synop．from the Schol．on Soph．，who explains the words $\dot{\rho} \alpha k \eta \beta \alpha \rho \in i a s ~ \nu o \eta \lambda$ лeias $\pi \lambda e ́ a$
 i．e．pus and bloody matter．
28．$\mu \epsilon \sigma \tau o i-d \nu o \mu i a s$.$] Meords is almost al－$ ways used cum genitivo mali．

29．oiкодомеіте］for dуoикодонсітте，＇ye keep in repair．＇Kooueite．Both the Jews and the Heathens alike showed their respect for the illustrious dead，by repairing and beautifying， and，when necessary，rebuilding their tombs．＇ See the，Classical citations adduced by Wets． ＂This，＂as Kuin．observes，＂our Lord did not mean to censure，but to expose the hypocrisy of the Pharisees in pretending a respect for the Prophets which they did not feel．＇

30．$\eta \mu \epsilon \theta a]$ There is the strongest testimony to the truth of this reading，（for the common one $j \mu \epsilon \nu$ ）which is found in most of the best MSS．，in some Fathers，and in the Ed．Princ． It was with reason preferred by Beng．，and edited by Matth．，Griesb．，and others down to Scholz．：$\eta \mu \mu \eta \nu$ was the usual Imperfect in the Hellenistic and Alexandrian dialect，though it was by the later Greeks changed into the old Attic form $\tilde{\eta}^{\nu} \nu . A \neq \mu a \tau \iota$ ，for фóvч．
31．$జ \sigma \tau \epsilon]$ itaque．Euthym．well explains the

 $\boldsymbol{d} \phi$＇$\dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \mu \mu е \bar{i} \sigma \theta \epsilon \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ ．Thus the connexion is traced without resorting to such violent means as are employed by some．Maptvpєite غ̇avtoìs， ＇you bear testimony against yourselves．＇For













$\mu a \rho \tau . ~ ' ф ' ~ \in a v \tau o u ́ s . ~ T h e ~ c o n s t r u c t i o n ~ i s ~ H e l-~$ Lenistic, and such as never occurs in the Clossical writers, who use kara with a Genit. rios emote resp nov., i. e. 'ye are of like disposition and manners to, \&cc.; for as they slew the prophets, so do ye meditate my death.'
 by many of the best Commentators, antient and modern, accounted an ironical concession, or permission, such as indignantly leaves the persons addressed to experience the consequences of their wilfulness. Of this sort of irony (very often occurring in Scripture) the Commentators adduce several examples. Grot., Guin., Wine, and Fritz., however, take it as an Imperative of permission, q. d. 'ye are permitted to fill up.' But the former method is preferable. Td $\mu$ éтрov,

 See Note on v. 22. Фúy ute. The best Commentators are agreed that this is put for $\phi$ eu $\xi \in \sigma \theta e$; the later writers imitating the Poetic idiom of using the Subjunctive for the Future; which is generally thought a solecism, but is learnedly defended by Fritz. in loc.
34. Ja тоüтo] On the force of this formula the Commentators are divided in opinion. Some think it has the force of the Heb. בקשה interea. Others connect it with the preceding. It is better, however, (with most recent Commentators) to consider it as a form of transition, as in Matt, xiii. 52. xxii. 29. Mark xii. 24. Yet, as that principle is somewhat precarious, I would, with Euthym. and Fritz., refer it to yer. 32.


 applies to his Apostles and their successors those titles which were given by the Jews to their Doctors, signifying that his messengers would be no less entitled to the appellation $\pi \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \mathrm{s}$ (in the sense, inspired interpreters of the will of God) than were the prophets of old; and would likewise be entitled to the appellations roфous,
 Divine legates.
 Acts vii. 59. \& xii. 2. $\Sigma$ тaupwoere. Though there is no evidence of the crucifixion of any Christian teacher before the destruction of Jeru-
salem, yet the silence of history (so exceedingly brief as it has come down to us) is no proof that there were none such. It is better to rest on this, than to suppose, with some, that Christ here ineludes himself; or to take oravo. in sensu impropro for 'to put to a cruel death.' Maбтьүш́⿱宀ете. See X. 17. and Acts xxii. 19.
35. $\ddot{0} \pi$ cos] This should be rendered not ta $u t$, but, as Hoogev. suggests, ut, hoc modo ut. Fritz. well expresses the sense of the passage thus: 'Vos omnino it agetis, ut videamini in id unicè intenti, ut omnis sanguinis justi atque insontis culpam solis sustineatis.' 'Екरuvóцешоע. This is, as Fritz. remarks, to be taken generally, so as to include both past, present, and future.
35. Zaxapiou- $\beta$ a $\rho a \chi i o u$, ] There has been much dispute as to the person here meant by our Lord. The various opinions are detailed and reviewed by Kuin. and Fritz. Those, and indeed most other Commentators, are of opinion that of the four who have been supposed to be here meant, the true one is that $Z_{\text {acharias, the }}$ high priest, who, for his having reproved the iniquities of the Jewish people, was, by the order of King Joash, slain between the sanctuary and the altar of whole burnt offerings. See 2 Chron. xxiv. 20, 21. And though this Joash be called son of Jehoiada, yet it was not unfrequent among the Jews to bear to names, especially when, as in the present case, the names were of the same meaning. After all, however, the Zechariah here meant may be the Prophet; for that he should have been murdered, is very probable; and though the Scripture does not say so, yet the silence of Scripture is no conclusive proof to the contrary. That he was murdered, we have iraditional testimony in a passage of the Targum, cited by Whity.

- Өvaıaoтnpiou.] ' the altar of burnt sacrifie,' which, Grot. shows, was in subdiali.

36. ör $t$ ], This is found in most of the best MSS. and some Versions and Fathers, as also in the Ed. Princ. It has been adopted by almost every Editor from Beng. to Scholz. "H $\xi \in-$ тaúтŋע. By тaùta $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a$ are meant ' all these crimes;' and ${ }^{\prime \prime} \kappa e \iota \nu$, or, as in the former verse, $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \in i \bar{\nu}, \quad \epsilon \pi l$ viva here signifies 'to come upon any one,' ' to be visited upon any one,' namely, to bring down punishment on his head.
37. in $\dot{\alpha} \pi о к т \epsilon i v o v \sigma a]$ Erasm. well points out
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the permanent action (as referring alike to past, present, and future) denoted by this use of the
 So I read, instead of the Stephanic auviriv, with the Edit. Princ., Beza, Schmid, and Griesb. There is no occasion to bring in the figure by which a transition is made from the second to the third person; which would here be very awkward. Tékva. The word is often used thus, figuratively, of the inhabitants of a city, both in the Scriptural and the Classical writers. 'Extovvajayeiv. The dxi is not, as the Commentators imagine, pleonastic, but signifies to. Thus the term signifies to draw together to one. "O ${ }^{\circ}$ тро́тоу. Sub. ка日.' 'H $\theta e \lambda$ ríare. The plural here has reference to the plural implied in 'lepou$\sigma \alpha \lambda r j \mu$, which means inhabitants of Jerusalem, an idiom frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers.
38. dфieral] Prophetic present put for future. Oiкos. Commentators are not agreed whether this is to be taken of the Temple, or of the whole Jewish nation, especially its metropolis (and so the Latin writers use patria and domus promiscuously.) The former sense is, indeed, applicable, but somewhat too weak; and therefore the latter seems preferable, at least, if it be limited to Jerusalem.
 modes of interpretation pursued in this perplexing passage. Some Commentators think that our Lord meant to predict his removal from them, until the destruction of Jerusalem, which is in the next Chapter designated under the name of the coming of the Lord. They render the words "̈́ws àv eïл 'would have reason to say.' And there is much to countenance this in the actual state of things at that period, as recorded by the accurate
 strained, and the interpretation is liable to serious objections. Greatly preferable is that of Chrysost. and others, who take the coming here spoken of to mean the second coming of our Lord to judgment at the end of the world. Thus by ye will be meant the Jewish nation. That the great bulk of the Jews will, ere that awful catastrophe, be brought to acknowledge that Messiah whom their ancestors rejected, we are taught by the sure word of prophecy. See Grot., Doddr., and Scott. Those who adopt this interpretation maintain that $\dot{\alpha} \pi^{\prime} \tilde{d}^{\prime} \rho \tau \iota$ should be rendered 'after a while,' i.e. after the ascen-
sion. But that sense is destitute of proof, and indeed unnecessary, if tojnts be taken (with Koecher) of familiar intercourse as a teacher; for our Lord had with the present address closed his public ministry. Eúdoy ${ }^{2} \mu$ évos, \&cc. was the form by which the Messiah (usually styled $\dot{\delta}$ épópevos, \&c.) was to be addressed in his coming.
 departing from the temple.'
 were pointing with wonder at their stateliness, as those do who admire any noble edifice. They seemed to say, "Is it possible that such a stately edifice should be so utterly destroyed?" Indeed, the destruction of the Temple was, in the minds of the Jews, viewed as coeval only with the end of the world, or at least that modification in its constitution which they supposed would take place at the coming of the Ilessiah. Thus the Jews employed the expression ovvté $\lambda \in L \alpha$ тoù alwivos to denote two periods, the coming of the Messich, and the end of time. Now the best Commentators are agreed that both these senses were had in view in the following predictions, and while the whole has a primary reference to the destruction of Jerusalem, yet the imagery and conformation are so applicable to the events which shall accompany the second advent of our Lord to judgment, that an allusion thereto must be supposed, if not a secondary sense. The two are here so blended as not only to afford a most weighty admonition to the hearers, but to make the prediction beneficial to all Christians of every age.
2. oí $\beta \lambda$ є́тетє] Several MSS. and Versions are without the ov, which is marked as probably to be omitted by Griesb. and others, and cancelled by Fritz. But that is too bold. The MS. evidence for it is incomparably stronger than that against it. Besides, had it not been in the text from the first, who would have thought of inserting it? for, when away, the same sense arises. But why, then, (it may be asked) should the ou have been removed? Because it is not employed agreeably to the Classical usage, and because it is not found in the parallel passage of Mark. The omission plainly originated in the Alexandrian school, as Scholz. is aware, who (together with Wets., Matth. and Tittm.) rightly retains the word.

- ov $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \phi \in \theta \bar{\eta}-\lambda i \theta o \nu]$ A proverbial and slightly hyperbolical expression denoting utter









destruction，but in this instance almost ful－ filled to the letter，as we learn from Joseph． B．J．vii．1，1．Euseb．，and the Rabbinical wri－ ters．The words os oi катa入vөíveral are added， to strengthen the preceding．See Soph．Antig． 441．and Hom．Il．xxi． 50 ．，referred to by Fritz． The $\mu \dot{\eta}$ is omitted in almost all the best MSS． and several Fathers，and is not found in the Edit．Princ．and other early Editions．It is re－ jected by Mill，Beng．，and Wets．，and cancelled by Math．，Griesb．，Knapp，Tittm．，Fritz．，and Scholz．，and justly，for scarcely any authority could justify so gross a barbarism．The $\mu \eta$ arose from the occurrence of oi $\mu \dot{\eta}$ just before， or came from the margin，where it was a correc－ tion of ou．And，indeed，Fritz．would prefer it to oí，if permitted by manuscript authority．
 to the dissolution of the coagmentatio lapidum．
 Commentators are much divided in opinion as to the meaning of this inquiry ；and four diffe－ rent hypotheses have been devised．The lst， confines the whole inquiry to the approaching destruction of Jerusalem．The 2d，extends it to tro questions，and includes the second advent of Christ in the regeneration，according to the Jewish expectation．The 3d，instead of the second substitutes the last advent of Christ at the end of the world and the general judgment． The 4th，（to use the words of Dr．Hales，who adopts it）unites all the preceding into three guestions，（to which distinct answers are given in this and the next Chapter）the 1st，relating to the destruction of Jerusalem；the 2d，to our Lord＇s second appearance in glory at the regene－ ration or restitution of all things，Acts iii． 21 ； the 3d，to the general judgment at the end of the world．＂The inquiry（observes Dr．Hales） involves three questions： 1 ．When shall these （things）be？and the sign when they shall hap－ pen ？2．And what the sign of thy presence？ and what the sign when all these things shall be concluded，or of the conclusion of the world．＂ See more in Dr．Hales，who supports this hypo－ thesis，originally propounded by Grot．Consult， however．Mr．Townsend，who in an able Disser－ tation，Vol．II．p．434．，（in common with Chrys．， Euthym．，and many antient Interpreters，and also the most eminent modern ones，）defends the first（or rather secomd）hypothesis．＂From their question（says Mr．Townsend）it appears that the disciples viewed the coming of Christ and the end of the world or age，as events nearly related，and which would indisputably take place together ；they had no idea of the dissolution of
the Jewish polity，with its attendant miseries， as really signified by，or included in，either of these events．They imagined，perhaps，a great and awful change in the physical constitution of the universe，which they probably expected would occur within the term of their own lives； but they could have no conception of what was really meant by the expression which they em－ ployed，the coming of Christ．The coming of Christ，and the end of the world，being therefore only different expressions to denote the same period as the destruction of Jerusalem，the pur－ port of the disciples＇question plainly is，When shall the destruction of Jerusalem be－and what shall be the signs of it？The latter part of the question is the first answered，and our Saviour foretells，in the clearest manner，the signs of his coming，and the destruction of Jerusalem．He then passes on to the other part of the question， concerning the time of his coming．History is the only certain interpreter of prophecy；and by a comparison of the two，we shall see with what stupendous accuracy the latter has been accom－ plished．＂The history of the Jewish war by Josephus fully illustrates this prophecy by a collection of facts which amply attest its fulfil－ ment．
 name and character of Messiah．Between these and the false prophets at ver． 11 ，a distinction must be made．Of the former were Simon Magus and Dositheus，and perhaps those ad－ verted to by Joseph．B．J．i．2．Of the latter were Theudas，Barchochebas the Egyptian，and many other impostors mentioned by Josephus． חגavíбovat，literally，＇will cause to wander from the truth，will deceive．＇
6．тodé $\boldsymbol{\mu o v s}]$ Wets．cites in illustration Joseph．Ant．18，9，1．，and on dкoas $\pi 0 \lambda$ ． Joseph．Ant．20，3，3．\＆4，2．；also Bell．Jud． 2，16．\＆1，1，2．，where Caligula orders his statue to be set up in the Temple at Jerusalem．
 points，（with Steph．）remarking that ©́pāte $\mu \dot{\eta}$ would signify videte，ne，and require $\theta \rho o \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta e$ ． $\Delta \epsilon i-y \in \nu \in \in \theta a t$ ．This is referred by the earlier modern Commentators to the counsel of God， who permits evil，to educe good therefrom．But it is better，with most recent interpreters，to take the expression as only denoting the certainty of the events predicted．T $\dot{\delta} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau}$ 入os is equivalent
 compares Hom．Il．$\beta$ ．121．тe入os $\delta^{\prime}$ oũco $\tau l$ $\pi$ т́фаитаи．
 many Commentators to various wars and civil










commotions. See Grot., Wets., and Kypke. Indeed most parts of the civilized world were then convulsed with wars or internal commotions.
- $\lambda_{\text {uol }} \mathrm{kal}$ 入ocmol] The words are often found joined in a similar context; and no wonder, the latter usually succeeding the former, ( to the citations from Quint. Curt. ix. 10. and Hesiod Op. 240. adduced by Wets. may be added Thucyd. i. 28.,) insomuch that кara
 ii. 54. The word $\lambda_{t \mu} \delta_{s}$ is well derived by Hemsterh. from $\lambda \in t \mu \mu \delta s$ (and that from $\lambda \in \lambda \in \iota \mu$ mac.) Yet I suspect that both words are of common origin, having the same general idea of pining, wasting away, \&c. Wets. adduces ample historical proofs justifying and illustrating both terms. Eeı $\mu \mu$ í. This must not be taken, with some, metaphorically, of violent civil commotions, but be understood literally, for it appears from the passages adduced by Wets. and Kuin. that earthquakes were always by the antients regarded as portents, presaging public calamity and distress. Historical illustrations of the literal sense may be seen in Wets, or Recens. Synop.
- кат $\alpha$ то́тоиs.] The earlier Commentators interpret 'in divers places;' but the recent ones, with Beza, 'every where,' by an ellips. of éќ́rrous. And this method is supported by some of the antient Versions. Perhaps, however, the true sense is, ' in various places.' The words are, I think, (with some antient Commentators and Wets. and Fritz.) to be referred not to $\sigma e t \sigma \mu o l$ only, but also to $\lambda \iota \mu o l$ and $\lambda o \iota \mu o f$.

8. т $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a$ dè-wíívcov.] We must here suppose an ellipse of $\mu$ óvov, as well as the usual one Errat; 'these are only the beginning and prelude of sorrows.' So Eurip. Med. 60. ¿v apx
 in the Sept. and Classical writers) used of severe affliction, whether bodily or mental, of which see examples in Recens. Synop.
9. тóte] This may (as Rosenm. suggests) be taken in a lax sense for circa ista tempora, since the events which follow happened partly before the above mentioned calamities, and partly at the same time with them. Пapaíwoovaty $\dot{\text { un . }}$ eis $\forall \lambda i \psi \iota v . ~ \Theta \lambda i \psi ı s$ properly signifies compression, and figuratively constraint, oppression, affliction, and persecution. The construction is the same as in a kindred passage of Jerem. xv. 4. тарад. els ג'עárкаs.
 ye shall be generally objects of hatred. The feeling of the Gentiles to Christians is plain
from various passages of the Classical writers. T $\bar{\omega} \nu \mathrm{d} \theta \nu \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$. The rōv is omitted in the common text; but it has place in very many MSS. and all the Edd. up to the Elzevir, in which, Wets. thinks, it was omitted by a typographical error. Be that as it may, it has been very properly restored by Beng., Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp. Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. $\Delta{ }^{\prime}$
 of) my religion.' The correspondence of the expressions in this and the following verses up to ver. 13., to facts recorded in History, has been shown by many writers.
10. $\sigma \kappa \alpha \nu \delta a \lambda \iota \sigma \theta$ j́ $\sigma \nu \tau a t$ ] 'will abandon their religion and renounce their faith.' ' $A \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \lambda$. rapad. See Note at iv. 12. This must (as Grot. says) be understood of apostates betraying those who continued in the faith.
11. , 廿єvior $\rho \circ \phi$. ̇ $\gamma \in \rho \theta$.] ' false teachers will arise,' namely, persons pretending to a Divine commission to preach deliverance and freedom from the Roman yoke.
 render, ' and because of the consummation of iniquity and lawlessness of every kind.' It seems better to assign this general sense to dvopiav, than any of those special ones which are given by one or other of the Commentators. This sense of the word is very frequent both in the New Testament and the Sept. There is something very similar in Ezr. ix. 6. ött al dyouias
 p. 400. takes avor. to mean 'the mystery of iniquity!

- $\psi v \gamma \gamma^{\eta} \sigma \in \tau a l$ म̀ $\left.\dot{a} \gamma . \tau . \pi.\right]$ ' the love of most shall grow cold.' By ar. some understand the love of God and religion; others, mutual love. The former is countenanced by the context ; but the latter (which is almost universally adopted by the antients and many eminent moderns) is more agreeable to the usus loquendi; though doubtless either sense is justified by facts.

13. í dè ̀̇̃upeivas els té̉os,] This many recent Commentators understand of the destruction of Jerusalem, rendering, 'he who endureth unto the destruction shall be saved,' namely, from the ruin which shall overwhelm its inhabitants. And indeed Ecclesiastical history informs us that few or no Christians perished in Jerusalem at that catastrophe, they having timely abandoned the city. Dr. Burton, Bampt. Lect. p. 402. compares the declaration contained in Revel. xxi. 7. \& 8. and John xvi. 1, 4. But this seems a strained mode of interpretation, and it is better, with the antient and early modern Com-
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mentators, and some eminent recent ones, (as Rosenm., Kuin., and Fritz.) to take $\dot{i} \pi \rho \mu$. els telos of perpetual perseverance in Christian faith and practice; and $\sigma \omega \theta$. of salvation in Heaven.
 tors understand this of the Roman world, i. e. the Roman Empire; for which signification of oikounévn there is valid authority brought forward in Recens. Synop. But as this is scarcely reconcileable with the words following, $\pi \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota$ тoìs efvegt, and since there is reason to think that Christianity had, at the period in question, been promulgated in countries which formed no part of the Roman Empire, (see Whitby and Doddr.) it may be better to retain the ordinary sense of the expression, understanding, by a slight hyperbole, a very considerable part of the then known world. Compare Rom. i. 8. \& x. 8.
 as Grot. and others explain, that the offer of salvation had been made to the Jews, by the rejection of which they had drawn down vengeance on their heads. The sense, however, seems rather to be, in order that all nations may know and be able to testify,' namely, that the Jews had filled up the measure of their iniquity and obstinacy by rejecting the proffered salvation, both spiritual and temporal. Td $\tau \in \lambda o s$, 'the end of the Jewish state, and the consummation of God's judgments against it.'
 has (by Hebraism) the force of an adjective, as in Luke i. 48. тaneivøots $\tau \bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ठoún $\eta$ s, for $\delta$ oú $\lambda \eta$ тaxeívq. The sense is, 'the abominable desolation,' i.e. the Roman army, always abominable, as composed of heathens, and carrying idolatrous standards, but then also abominably desolating, as being invaders and destroyers. 'Ev tónç cyio. Most Commentators, from Grot. downwards, explain this 'on holy ground.' But Bp. Middlet. has shown that this interpretation is angrounded, for the phrase occurs elsewhere only at Acts vi. 13. xxi. 28., where it can only be understood of the Temple; in the Sept. it is often used, and always of the Temple, sometimes the Sanctum Sanctorum. There is no reason to abandon the antient and common interpretation 'in the holy place,' which is required by the parallel passage in Mark xiii. 14., and is confrmed by the history of the completion of the prophecy in Josephus.
 most supposed to be our Lord's, and meant to fix the attention of his hearers. But the best recent Commentators, with reason, consider them
as a parenthetical admonition of the Evangelist, conveying serious warning ; and perhaps founded on Daniel ix. 25. каl ү $\nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ каl $\delta \iota a \nu 0 \eta \theta_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \eta$. Nociv signifies properly to turn in mind, and, from the adjunct, to attend.
16. тӧтє] 'when these things take place.' Ot $\dot{\varepsilon} y$ 'Iovóaí, i. e. the inhabitants of Judæa, as opposed to those of Jerusalem. Tád ö only as being natural strong holds, (often used as such, as we find from Josephus) but because they abounded in large caverns, wherein the Jews, at times of public calamity, often took refuge.
17. exil toù $\delta \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \tau \sigma o s, \& c$.] In this and the two following verses we have some proverbial (and somewhat hyperbolical) forms of expression denoting the imminency of the danger, and the necessity of the speediest flight. It has ever been customary in the East to build the houses with flat roofs, provided with a stair-case both outside and inside. By this way (or, as others more probably suppose, over the roois of the neighbouring houses, and so to the city wall) their flight is recommended to be taken.
$-\tau \dot{j}]$ This (instead of the common reading) is found in all the best MSS., together with the Edit. Princ. and other antient Edd. confirmed by the Syr. and Coptic Versions and many Fathers. It has also been approved by almost every one of the recent Editors, and received from Matth. down to Scholz; and with reason, for the common reading arose from ignorance of the nature of the more recondite expression $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \dot{k}$ T. o., which, as Fritz. well remarks, is put for

 which may be taken from the preceding olkias. By the $\tau \dot{a} l \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota a$ are meant the upper garments, (i.e. cloak and coat) which husbandmen of the Southern countries have ever, when at work, laid aside, or left at home. So Hesiod. Op. ii. 9. (cited by Elsn.) Г $\nu \mu \nu \nu \nu \sigma \pi \in i \rho \epsilon \nu$, रv $\mu \nu \dot{\nu}$
 209. Nudus ara, sere nudus. Grot. and Wets. would take $\tau \alpha$ i $\mu \dot{\alpha} \tau<c a$ in a singular sense, as we say clothes for dress. Whichever interpretation be adopted, there is no need to alter the reading, and adopt $\tau d$ d $\mu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \circ \nu$, with Mr. Valpy.
19. oùal $\begin{aligned} & \dot{d} \in-\eta j \mu \hat{t} p a t s .] ~ I t ~ w a s ~ u n n e c e s s a r y ~ f o r ~\end{aligned}$ Grot. and Wolf. to detail the jus belli as to women so situated, for our Lord only, while he predicts, deplores (a fine trait of his benevolence) the miserable lot of such persons. This uoe was (as the records of history testify) amply fulfilled.
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20. $\chi \in \mu \bar{\omega} \nu o s$,$] The Commentators supply the fulness of the Godhead bodily, savours of$ önvos, But dia is preferable. No ellipse, irreverence.
 Theudas and the son of Judas, the Galilean, and others mentioned by Josephus.
 resting question here arises, whether these onueia and $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \tau a$ were really performed, or merely promised and engaged. The antient and early modern Commentators, and also a few recent ones, adopt the former opinion, ascribing the deeds to Dæmoniacal agency. The latter view is taken by most recent Commentators, who refer to a similar use of dioóvaı in Deut. xiii. 2. 1 Kings xiii. 3. \&c 5. Yet some have of late, and with reason, preferred the interpretation proposed by me in Recens. Synop., namely, (by a substitution of the attempt for the action, as in many other passages) 'they will attempt, or profess, to show,' \&c. These $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i \alpha$ and $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho a \tau \alpha$ (between which terms there need not be any such distinction made as in the Classical writers) were, no doubt, various sleights of pretended magic produced by optical deception, simulated cures of disorders founded in artful collusion, \&c.; also, as far as there might be reality, wonders performed by dæmoniacal agency, such (in the words of 2 Thess. ii.9.) as were produced $\kappa \alpha \boldsymbol{\tau}^{\circ}$
 бךцеioss каl тépaбt 廿ev́dous.

- el duyacty,] This expression, it is clear, does not imply impossibility, but only extreme difficulty in the performance of what is possible. So Matt. xxvi. 39. Acts xx. 16. Rom. xii. 18. It is manifest that this text ought never to have been adduced to prove the doctrine of the perseverance of the elect.

26. eढ $\sigma$ • • i. e. He (q.d. you know who) is, namely the Messiah. There is something graphic in this use of the pronoun for the appellative; which, though it had been long generally adopted of that great Personage who was the object of universal expectation, yet in this case it was employed by the lurking adherents of false Christianity by way of caution. 'E E Eprifes. The very place where (as we find from Joseph.) these impostors usually appeared and abode. 'Ey тois $\tau a \mu$ elots. This is not to be taken, with most Commentators, as plural for singular ; but, as Schleus. and Fritz. rightly observe, тap. is to be taken as denoting a genus, q. d. He is in the kind of places called tapteia (i. e. secret apartments) namely, in one or other of them.









 this exquisite simile is represented the suddenness (and, as some think, the conspicuousness) of Christ's advent to take vengeance on the Jews. The flash of lightning is an image of celerity and suddenness common to writers of every language and age. See examples in Recens. Synop. At dंख d dvaroncin (in which expression both Classical and Scriptural writers use the plural) sub. $\eta$ iov, which is expressed in Soph. ©d. C. 1245.

 with the preceding is variously traced. But the yaj must not be too rigorously interpreted; or. tt may be thought to have reference to a clause omitted. In this figurative language (which seems founded on Job xxxix. 40. oü $\delta^{\prime} d^{\prime} \nu \dot{w}^{\prime} \sigma$
 from ver. 27, and was perhaps proverbial) there seems (according to the opinion of the best Commentators, as Hamm., Whit., Wets., Rosenm. and Kuin.) an allusion to the certainty as well as suddenness of the destruction. By the eagles are plainly meant the Romans; and as eagles very rarely feed on dead carcasses, so (the best Commentators are agreed) the bird here meant is the Vultur percnopterus or yunaerds, which was by the antients referred to the eagle genus. By the $\pi \boldsymbol{\omega}_{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \mu \alpha$ is meant the Jewish nation, not as being, (according to some, ) spiritually and judicially dead, but as lying, like the fabled Prometheus, a miserable prey to the foes who were tearing out her vitals.
27. ceivecos $\delta \dot{d} \& c \mathrm{c}$.] On these and the following verses the opinions of Commentators are much divided. The antients and early moderns understand the expressions, literally, and refer the whole to the awful events which shall precede the final catastrophe of our globe, and the day of judgment; especially as in the next Chap. and other parts of Scripture the same signs are mentioned as ushering in the last great day. But the connerion here, which is even stronger in the parallel places of Mark and Luke, and the assurance contained in them all, "this generation shall not pess away till all be fulfilled," has induced the most eminent modern Commentators to refer the passage to the signs accompanying the despruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish nation. They consider the language as highly figurative, understanding by the darkening of the sun, \&c. the ruin of states and great personages. The appearance of the sign of the Son of Man they take to denote the subversion of the Jewish state; and the gathering together of his elect they refer to the gathering of the Christian Church out of
all nations. " In antient Hieroglyphic writings (says Bp. Warburton) the sun, moon, and stars were used to represent states and empires, kings, queens, and nobility; their eclipse or extinction denoted temporary disasters, or entire overthrow. So the Prophets in like manner call kings and empires by the names of the heavenly luminaries. Stars falling from the firmament are employed to denote the destruction of the nobility and other great men; insomuch that, in reality, the prophetic, style seems to be a speaking hieroglyphic." See also Whit. and Doddr., who refer to Is. xiii. 9. li. 6. Ez. xxxii. 7. Dan. viii. 10. Est. viii. 16. Jer, xv. 9. Joel iii. 15. Amos viii. 9. And many examples have been adduced of similar figurative language in the Classical writers. Yet as the expressions admit of explanation according to each of the above hypotheses, it may be safer to unite both interpretations, one as the primary, the other as a secondary sense, (of which there are many exemples in Scripture; ) or (as I suggested in Recens. Synop.) to suppose some reference or allusion to the latter, by way of analogy or accommodation. And the latter may be said to be the more august, though the other is the more literal accomplishment of the prophecy.
 admits of two explanations, according to the two hypotheses above mentioned. If the former be adopted, it must be understood of the falling of the stars from the apparent concave sphere in which they and the sun and moon are fixed; of course producing a darkness. According to the latter, it will denote, in conjunction with the foregoing phrases, those great obscurations of the light of the heavenly bodies which, Josephus tells us, took place during the siege of Jerusalem, and which attend earthquakes. Similar expressions are cited from Herodot. 7, 37. Statius 10. and other authors. Rosenm., Kuin., and Fritz. understand it of those fiery globules called falling stars which were by the antients thought to portend calamities. But that would be a circumstance too insignificant to consort with the sublimity of the context. Ai סuvd $\mu$ eıs toù oùpayoù is an expression frequent in the Sept. to denote the heavenly bodies. There is no vain repetition, but a strong emphasis is contained, in the expression of the same thing in other words. इa $\lambda$ ef. ecotas is used properly of the tossing to and fro of ships at anchor. See Thucyd. 1, 137. where see my note.
28. tò onneīov toù vioù toù du0.] Wolf, Rosenm., and Kuin. think that $\tau \delta$ onjeiov is put pleonastically, since it is omitted by Mark
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and Luke. But though it might be dispensed with, it here adds something to the sense. Some suppose an allusion to the sign from heaven required. See supra xvi. 1. But it should rather seem that rd $\sigma \eta \mu \in i=\nu$ merely means the visible appearance, 'then shall be displayed the visible appearance of the Son of Man,' i.e. then shall the Son of Man visibly appear, (agreeably to what the Jews understood from the prophecy in Dan. vii. 13.) and give manifest evidences of his power by taking vengeance on the Jews.

By al $\phi u \lambda a l$ т $\overline{\mathrm{s}} \gamma^{\gamma} \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ is meant, as the best modern Commentators, and also Chrysost. are agreed, the inhabitants of Judæa, who would have cause enough to lament. See Luke xxiii. 28. There is a reference to Zech. xii. 12. And St. John in the Apoc. i. 7, certainly had in mind
 $\nu \in \phi e \lambda \bar{\omega} \nu$ we have splendid imagery assimilated to the character of Hebrew poetry, to designate majesty of approach.
 again there is much diversity of interpretation; which, however, might have been avoided, had the Commentators considered the two-fold application of the whole of this most interesting portion of Scripture, which even those who recognise it before seem here to forget. The application of the words to the final advent of our Lord is too obvious to need pointing out. (Compare, in this view, the sublime description in 1 Cor. xv.) But neither ought the advent of our Lord to the destruction of Jerusalem to have been unperceived by any ; for in that application the words have great propriety ; тous $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \gamma \in \lambda$ ous denoting (as the best Commentators admit) the preachers of the Gospel, announcing the message of salvation, and gathering those who shall accept its offer from every quarter of the globe into one society under Christ, their common head. That God's prophets and ministers, both in the Old and the New Testament, are often called his árye入ol, is cer-
 the construction, unperceived by many, is $\mu \in \tau \alpha$
 most Commentators to have a reference to preaching, as compared to the sound of a trumpet, as Is. lviii. 1. Jer. vi. 17. Ez. xxxiii. 2-6. Rom. x. 18. But in both the above applications there seems a reference to the method of
convoking solemn assemblies, both among the Jews and Gentiles, namely, by sound of trumpet. The words are therefore not, as Kuin. imagines,
 (which has been misunderstood) has reference to the place (heaven), or the society to which the faithful followers of Christ are gathered. The words èк $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ т тeqб. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \omega \nu$ are a Hebrew form denoting 'from all quarters of the globe;' for the Jews not only took the winds to denote the cardinal points of the heaven, (at that early period only four) but employed them to mark the regions which lay in the direction of any of them. The words $d \pi^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \omega \nu-a \dot{u} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ are also an Hebrew form, serving as an emphatic repetition of the same thing; where áкpouv denotes those parts of the world where the earth and heaven (according to this common phrase) were supposed to border upon each other.
 reply to the inquiry at ver. 3 . respecting the time of this destruction, which, our Lord intimates, will be as plainly indicated by the signs before mentioned as the approach of Summer by the early buds of the fig-tree. There is something unusual in the turn of the expression. It seems to be an elliptical mode of speaking, of which the sense is, "Learn (and make use of) the similitude, or emblem supplied by the fig-tree." See Heb. ix. 9 .

- dंगa入ds] ' tender, soft, sappy.' Td 0 ©́pos, i. e. rather Spring than Summer, by an imitation of the Hebrew, in which language there are no terms to denote Spring and Autumn, the former being included under ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{p}$ (the Summer), the latter under חר the Winter. The cause of this idiom is generally sought for in the temperature of the East; but as it occurs in the Western languages also, (as the Greek and the German) it is probably a vestige of the simplicity and poverty of the primitive speech. The phrase fryùs $E \pi l$ Oúpais is formed from two blended together for emphasis, and therefore denotes the closest proximity, 'close at the door.' The Nominative at tort is to be supplied from the preceding context; and therefore can be no other than ó vids roü $\alpha \nu \theta$ poisiou, or (as I have proposed in Recens. Synop.) ì тepiovala toù vidu toù àvtpájou.
 of some, the phrase, (it is admitted by the best
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Commentators,) can only mean 'this very generation,' 'the race of men now living.'
36. терi $\delta \in \tau \bar{\eta} s$ rimépas \&c.] This verse is by many Commentators referred solely to the final advent of Christ, the day of judgment ; but without sufficient reason; since there is here no closer allusion to the day of judgment than in the preceding verses; and as the versesfollowing undoubtedly relate, primarily at least, to the destruction of Jerusalem, so must this. 'H riuépa ekeivn is used of the destruction of Jerusalem in various passages. In the al $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\delta} \pi \alpha \pi \dot{\prime} \rho$ нovds the Commentators have failed to see that oid' els is to be supplied from the preceding clause meaning of course the Son. The ei $\mu \eta$ is plainly imperfect, and needs something to be supplied. Now Mark espreses what Matthew has left to be supplied. That the Son should not know the precise time of the destruction of Jerusalem, or of the end of the world, ought not to be drawn by the Unitarians to prove the mere humanity of Christ; for the expression has reference solely to his human nature; since though as Son of God he was ornniscient, as Son of Man he was not so. See several other views of the sense detailed in Recens. Synop. on Mark xiii. 32.
37. ब̈न्यe $8 \dot{8} \mathrm{kc}$.] The sense is, ' the same ahall happen at the advent of Christ, as did in the time of Noah,' namely, the calamity shall be oudden and unexpected. This general sentiment is unfolded in ver. 37-41. Compare Luke xvii. 20. seqq. (Kuin.)
38. трळуоитеs-dкүанi乌ovтes] There is no reason to put any strong emphasis on the words tpójoures and aivoures; still less to take $\gamma a \mu$. and dryap. of unlawful lusts; for the best Commentators are rightly of opinion that the words exprese no more than the security and gaiety with which they pursued the usual employments and amusements of life, when on the brink of deatruction. Yet, considering the solemn warning subjoined to these words in Luke xvii. 34., it is mplied that the antediluvians were guilty of sroess senguality. See more in Recens. Synop. 30. obx ${ }^{\text {If }}$ ruovay ] i. e., by a common Hebraism
in $y>$, they did not attend or consider, did not make use of their knowledge. This sense is, however, sometimes found in the Classical writers.' 'H $\rho$ ev, 'swept away.' The Classical writers say aipeiv éк $\mu$ écov, de medio tollere. Thus alpecl answers to the Heb. кus necare, in Job xxxii. 22. 1 Macc. v. 2.
40. тóre ঠóo $\tilde{\epsilon} \sigma o \nu \tau a \iota ~ \& c$.] The scope of this and the following verse is not clear. Some take it to denote that the destruction will be as general as unexpected, so that no two persons employed together shall escape. Others, with more reason, suppose it to mean that some of both sexes should escape, while others should perish; implying a providential distinction.
41. ठúo $\dot{i} \lambda \dot{\gamma} \dot{\theta}$ ouvat] The $\mu \dot{u} \lambda \omega \nu$ was a handmill composed of two stones turned by two persons, generally females. See my note on Thucyd. ii. 78.
 1. to be wakeful; 2. to be watchful, vigilant, circumspect.
Some of the best Commentators antient and modern are agreed that our Lord's discourse on the destruction of Jerusalem terminates at ver. 41., and that what follows, being so peculiarly applicable to the final advent of our Lord, forms, as it were, the moral of the prophecy, and its practical application to his disciples of every age. Many of the above Commentators, too, think that it was spoken at another time, and upon another occasion, since Luke places it (xii. 39.) in another connexion. But as the portion in question is applicable in both connexions, there is no reason why we should not suppose that our Lord employed this warning twice. The application of the subsequent parables, both as they regard ministers and Chris, tians in general, is too plain to need being dilated on.
43. фu入aкy] for ©ja, which is read in some MSS., but by gloss. The sense is, ' at what particular time. The warning to vigilance is pointed by the use of a familiar allusion perfectly adapted to the country, and the state of society in Judæa,
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 óóvt $\omega \nu$.
and therefore also employed by St. Paul, St. Peter, and St. John. See 1 Thess. v. 2. 2 Pet. iii. 10. Rev. iii. 3. "Epxerat, 'is come, will, or would, come.'
44. ' dı $\alpha$ тои̃то] i.e. 'because ye are in the same situation as the householder.'
45. tis \& $\rho \alpha$ d $\sigma \tau l$ ] The Commentators have been perplexed with the rts, which some take in the sense qualis, or quantus; but others (and indeed all the most eminent) regard as put hypothetically for et rts, of which usage they adduce examples, which, however, are not applicable, because (as Fritz. remarks) in nearly all of them the interrogation is suitable and applicable. And thus the Article will have no force. I agree with Fritz. in regarding this (like some of those in the examples adduced) as an interrogation conjoined with exclamation. The.sense may be thus expressed: 'Who then is that faithful and attentive servant (i. e. I should much wish to know him) whom, since he is to be esteemed happy,' \&c. This interpretation is confirmed by the authority of Chrys., who observes that the tis is meant to express how rare and valuable such servants are.
 Tw上; abstract for concrete; on which idiom see Matth. Gr. Gr. This idiom is almost confined to words signifying service. 'Ev кaı $\rho \bar{\omega}$, $\mathbf{i}$. e., as appears from what is said by Casaub. and Le Clerc, monthly.

 dispenser, or olкоуомos, he will make him dziтротоs, procurator, treasurer, steward; which was a greater honour.
48. © кaкds $\delta$. éкeĩos] It is not easy to see what ixeivos has here to do ; the bad servant not having been yet mentioned; and there is plainly no regular opposition between the two. Fritz. has cancelled the word, as having been introduced from ver. 46. But it is almost impossible that this should have happened in all the MSS., and yet none countenance the omission. The word must therefore be retained, and explained as it may. And, unless it be a Hellenistic pleonasm, it may serve to strengthen the Article d,
which may be thought to require it ; for throughout this parable the Article is subservient to the purpose of hypothesis. See Middlet. Gr. A. C. 111. \$2. And as in such cases the Article was considered by the antient Grammarians as used indefinitely, so it might seem to need the assistance of éceivos, to give it more of definiteдеss.
49. aúroū] This word is inserted, from several of the best MSS., Versions, and Fathers, by Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. All the best Editors from Wets. to Scholz are agreed on the emendation e $\sigma \theta i n$ кal $\pi i \nu \eta$, for $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta$ sect and rivetv; which has the strongest evidence of MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and is required by one of the most certain of Critical canons.
51. $\delta \iota \chi 0 \tau 0 \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \iota a \dot{u} \tau \dot{\delta} \nu]$ On the interpretation of $\delta_{i x}$ रor. there has been no little difference of opinion. See Recens. Synop. The senses 'will turn him away,' or, 'will confiscate his goods,' are alike unauthorized, feeble, and frigid, nay inconsistent with the parallel passage of Luke. Most Commentators explain it literally, of the antient punishment of being saun asunder. But as the sufferer seems in the words following represented as surviving the punishment, this cannot well be admitted. Hermann, Doddr., Rosenm., and Kuin. take $\delta$ ix. in a figurative sense to denote a most severe flagellation, by a figure common to most languages antient and modern. So Hist. Susannæ, v. 55. oxfoet oe $\mu e ́ \sigma o v . \& 39 . \pi \rho i \sigma a l ~ \sigma \epsilon \mu$ évov. When it is said
 (by which is meant, ' will place him in the same situation with the hypocrites') we must understand, 'when he survives his punishment,' which many would not. There is an allusion to the general treatment of delinquent slaves, whose miseries are well expreased by the к $\lambda a u \neq \mu d s$ кal


After all, however, the objection, that the sufferer is afterwards mentioned as alive, may not be fatal to the literal interpretation of $\delta 1 \times$.; for I agree with Fritz., that in the words following kal тd Mépor-0rifec the similitude is blended with the thing signified. Yet it is not necessary
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to adopt that interpretation, since the other is equally well founded. Thus, however, is avoided the difficulty which otherwise embarrasses the word uxocpiteiv, which the Commentators vainly endeavour to remove by various devices in translation. The sense seems to be, 'As he will miserably scourge him, and consign him to the woeful abode of incorrigible criminals; 80 will the Lord consign the wilfully disobedient disciple to the abode of the hypocrites,' i. e. (as the Jews universally acknowledged) to Hell. In the parallel passage of Luke there is not this blend-
 servant.
XXV. 1. Tóre $\delta \mu$ oscovíretaı \&c.] The scope of this parable (to which one very similar is adduce from a Rabbinical tract) and the various circumstances are fully illustrated in Recens. Synop. and Horne's Introd. Vol. II. p. 400. mir. pp. $399,417$. sq. The parable is meant to intimate the necessity of continued vigilance, constant prayer, and perseverance in every good work ; and is especially designed to discourage all trust in a late repentance.

- Sika] Some certain number was likely to be used, and from this parable and a passage from a Rabbinical writer cited by Wets., we may infer that ten was a favourite number with the Jews.
 'the other five. Such is the force of the Article.

3. alrwee $\mu$ copal 'such as were foolish.' The phraseology is Hellenistic, to which Fritz. has without reason taken exception. Aúrciv. This is edited by Scholz, from many of the best MSS.
4. ¿ע6orakav, cal dx áधevסov] 'they nodded, and [then] fell asleep.'
 used in the Sept.; though the same Hebrew word 3 won is by the Sept. used both for кобpeiv and dreoxeviayou. The sense is, 'put them in
order,' ' made them fit for use,' I am not, however, aware that the word is elsewhere used with $\lambda a \mu \pi a ́ \delta \alpha$, and therefore I suspect that it is one of the phrases of common life, which are not found in the Classical writers.

 plainly something wanting, to be supplied. Severail Commentators, as Kosenm., and Kin., would supply ova $\omega$, and take $\mu$ rтore in the sense perhaps. But the proof is weak, and the sense somewhat lame. It is better, with Erasm., Wolf; and Elsn., to suppose an ellipsis of бкотеїтє, or opārє, or, (what Fritz. proposes) фoßoúne日a or deocá $\mu \in \nu$. After all, the best founded ellipse may be that of the negative particle, or some negative phrase (as in Gen. xx. 11.) which is adopted in E. V. and preferred by Hoogev., and is also supported by Euthym. The negative is, I conceive, omitted verecundia gratis; for the antients attached some sort of shame to denying a request.

- торкícol-iautais] This seems to have been a common mode of expression used to those who asked what could not be spared; and, of course, forms an ornamental circumstance. It is amazing that this passage should have been adduced to support the Romish doctrine of works of supererogation, since the circumstance, whethe regarded as essential, or ornamental, puts a negative on the doctrine. See Chrys. and Euthym. in Recens. Synop. The do before $\mu \bar{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ is cancelled by Griesb. and Scholz, from several MSS.; but wrongly, since the current of authority runs the other way, and the usus loquendi of Scripture is adverse, for Fritz. truly says, "ubique N. T. lock hujusmodi etiam \& habent, non $\mu \bar{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ av solum."

10. ai 'roıцои] 'those who were ready.' This absolute use of "'r aches with persons is rare, with things not infrequent.
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11. aik ol $\delta \alpha \dot{v} \mu \bar{\alpha}$.] The best Commentators are agreed that the sense is, 'I do not recognize you as among those who accompanied me and my spouse;' or, regarding it as a common form of repulsion, 'I know nothing about you.'
 omitted in several good MSS., most of the Versions, and some Fathers, and are cancelled by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz. They have certainly the air of a gloss.
 rable (which is not the same with the very similar one in Luke xix. 12.) the apodosis is wanting, i.e. 'as that person did, so will the Son of Man do ;' or rather there is an anacoluthon, arising from inattention to the construction. 'Axos $\eta \mu \omega \bar{y}$, ' on taking his departure.' Or it may, with' Fritz., be taken for dᄌoöทueîv 0i $\lambda \cos$. 'Idfovs for aútoû.
12. кacà тทㄴ ldiav סóvapuv] ' according to each one's particular capacity, and ability to exaploy the money to advantage.' Thus it seems that masters sometimes (as is still the case in the East, and in Russia) committed to their slaves eome capital, to be employed in traffic, for the improvement of which they were to be accountable to them.
 which is almost always expressed in the Clas-
sical writers. This use of $\delta \nu$ is Hellenistic. A Classical writer would have used $k \pi i$. In this use ejoráracoat signifies to invest capital, or to make money. 'Exoincev, 'acquired by traffic ;' a use chiefly found in the later Grecism; the earlier and purer writers employing кepठ̄̄̃as.
13. $\infty \rho \cup \xi \in \nu]$ scil. ठँ $\quad v \gamma \mu a$, which is implied. See Herodot. iv. 71.
14. quvaipet-Aóyov.] See Note on Matt. xviii. 23.
15. $\mathrm{k} \mathrm{x}^{\prime}$ aúrois ] to, in addition to ; on which signification see Matth. Gr. Gr.
16. $\phi \eta \delta^{\prime}$.] The $\delta d$ is omitted in many good MSS. and some Versions, and is cancelled by Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. Bí for eũy, which was used like our bravo! and therefore often employed at the public games by the multitude in the expression of applause. 'Exl silya, sub. кaтaनтa日eis. The syntax with the Accus. (which is rare) occurs also at Hebr. ii. 7. Tìv xapà. Some of the best Commentators are of opinion that in order to keep the story apart from the application, we should here take xap., by a metonymy of the adjunct, in the sense banquet. It is not necessary, however, to abandon the common interpretation, which, as Chrys.
 ptótyra. The Synchysis in question is not unusual in the antient writers.













24．©̌vay oe ötヶ．］On this construction， which depends on attraction，see Win．Gr．Gr． p．186．इkגnoos，hard－bearted，griping．The expressions following are formulas，probably in common use with agricultural persons，expres－ give of the habits of such persons．Though some similar ones are found in the Classical writers， nor are they wanting in our own language．We may render，＇${ }^{\text {r reaping where thou hast not sown，}}$ and harvesting where thou hast not scattered （namely the seed．＇）Thus dıaбкортi\} civ signifies to sow in Is．xxviii．29．（Aquila）where the Sept．has oxeipetw．So Schleus．and others explain dcackopx．I would，however， prefer to take it of turning the corn，to pro－ pare it for carrying，which is what is meant by cuyáyous．For the sense winnowing，assigned by Fischer，Rosenm．，and Kuin．，there is no authority in Scripture，and if there were，it would here be inapplicable．

25．$\phi_{0} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\boldsymbol{\eta} \theta}$ es］i．e．fearing lest，if I should lose the money，thou wouldst severely exact it of me，by taking away all my substance．（Kin．） This was evidently a mere excuse；but，as Euthym．observes，the parable puts a weak ex－ cure into the mouth of the slothful servant，in order to show that in such a case no reasonable apology can be made．
－ide，Execs rd aóv．］Formula nihil ultra debere se profitentis．（Grot．）We have a similar one in English．So also xx．14．¿ joy $\tau d$ Góv． Of this idiom，neglected by Philologists，ex－ apples may be seen in Recens．Synop．
26．жаuпре́ sal סккиреє］Campo．has here an able note on the distinction between words nearly， but not quite，synonymous，as exemplified in какдs，тоипроs，ávomos，äduos．＂Though such words（says he）are sometimes used promiscu－ ously，yet there is a difference．Thus $\dot{d} \dot{\partial}$ cos properly signifies unjust ；ävonos，lawless，cri－ minal ；кaxds，vicious；жovnpos，malicious．Ac－ condingly，кaкds is opposed to dyápetos，or dikatos；тоцทрos，to a jatos．Kaxia，is vice； rompia，malice，or malignity．This is the use of the words in the Gospel．Thus the negligent， riotous，debauched servant in C．xxiv．48．is
 Here the bad servant is not debauched，but slothful，and，to defend his sloth，abusive．Thus in $\times x$ ．32．the inexorable master is called $\pi$ ounpós． A malignant，that is，an envious，eye is rovnpds，
not $\kappa a \kappa \delta s$ ．${ }^{\circ} \phi \theta_{a} \lambda \mu o s$ ．The disposition of the Pharisees is termed кaкós，and the devil is termed is moypods，not oj кaкós．＂
－$j \dot{\delta} \mathrm{ec}$ ，\＆ce． ．This is said（as Euthym．and Grot．observe）by the figure Synchoresis：＇Be it as you say，that I am，\＆cc．then ought you to have taken the more care not to deprive me of what is really my own．Though it were true，as you say，that I reap where I sow not，and you durst not risk the money in merchandise；you ought to have put it out to the public money changers to interest ；some exertions should have been made．＇This，however，will not be neces－ sary，if the words are taken interrogatively．I have，therefore，wish Griesb，and Fritz．，placed the mark of interrogation．
27．$\beta a \lambda$ eìv］for dióóvat，as in Luke xix．23．， or the more Classical $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a t$ ．Tраже乌íaus． These discharged not only the offices of our bankers，in receiving and giving out money，in taking or giving interest upon it，but also in exchanging coins，and distinguishing genuine from forged money．Tóke，＇interest；＇for the word only imports what is produced by，as we say，turning money，which，indeed，was origi－ rally the sense of usury，i．e．the profit allowed to the lender for the use of borrowed money． But，indeed，if the tox were taken in the worst sense that was ever ascribed to usury，it would not imply Christ＇s approbation，since the whole （as has been before observed）is said ka qa
 received back．＇комi＇̧ec日at signifies to carry off； and it is generally implied that the thing was before in our possession．
28．äpare oz，\＆c．］These words（says Ruin．） merely serve as a finish to the picture．
29．Tue，Yah éxovt t，\＆c．］On this proverb see Math．xiii．12．and Note．We may here para－ phrase，with Guin．，＇When any one does not properly use gifts bestowed，or benefits received， even these are taken from him．But to him who rightly employs them，more are bestowed，as re－ wards of his good management．＇On the $\mu \eta$ in Tout $\mu \eta$ ex exorros it may be observed，that this is used rather than ours because a supposition is implied；（See Herman．Vig．p．805．）as is the case with participles taken generally，and cor－ responding to quicunque，or siquis，as Matt．ix． 36．Joh．v．23．Rom．xiv．3． 1 Cor．vii．30．See Finer＇s Gr．Gr．p． 156.
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30．${ }^{\text {xpeiov．］Literally，＇good for nothing，}}$ bad．＇This meiostis extends to many other words of similar signification，as $\tilde{\alpha} \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau o s, d \xi u ́ \mu \phi o \rho o s$,
 responding to the Tartarus of the Heathen My－ thology．Of the same kind is the expression at
入ere，í $\kappa \beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda$ ere is found in very many MSS．， the Edit．Princ．，and some Fathers，and is adopted by Beng．，Wets．，Matth．，Griesb．， Knapp，Vat．，Fritz．，and Scholz．In a matter， however，so indifferent，number of MSS．ought， if any where，to decide．Besides，the Scribes were far more prone to convert double conso－ nants into single ones，than the contrary．
31．$\partial \tau, a \nu \delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \eta, \& c$ ．］＇Now when the Son of Man，＇\＆cc．Pressing the warnings inculcated in the preceding parables，our Lord proceeds to speak of the great day of retribution in a de－ scription which（Doddr．observes）is one of the noblest instances of the true sublime any where to be found．We have 1．the extent of the judg－ ment ；2．the methods with which it will be car－ ried on；3．the phice and circumstances．The imagery is partly derived from the pompous mode of administering justice in the East，（See Ps．ix． 5－9．Zach．xiv．3．Is．vi．1．Ixvi．I．Dan．vii． 9 ． 1 Thess．iv．16．）and partly it is a pastoral metaphor（frequent in Scripture）adverting to the antient Eastern custom of keeping separate the sheep and the goats．And，besides the re－ spective dispositions of the two animals，as sheep were more valuable than goats，they would，in an allegory wherein the Messiah and those whom he was to guide，are compared to a Shepherd and his sheep，fitly represent the former the accepted，and the latter the rejected．

 omitted in several MSS．，and is cancelled by Griesb．and Fritz．，as having been introduced from the parallel place of Mark；but is retained by Wets．：Matth．，and Scholz．Tbe point is doubtful，but the quarter from whence the omis－ sion comes is suspicious．

32．жávia $\tau \dot{a}$ é $\theta \nu \eta]$ i．e．both Jews and Gen－ tiles，both quick and dead．
34．$\delta$ ßaбi入eis］So called，the Commentators say，as then exercising the highest act of kingly power．And indeed the kingly and judicial au－ thority were then closely united．But perhaps the term is merely used in accordance with the preceding Regal imagery．Toù marpós．Some supply $\dot{\text { njod}}$ ；but the Genit．may of itself note the efficient cause；not to say，with Frit．that ol eù or $\eta \mu$ évot is in some measure a noun．



 thought to countenance the doctrines of absolute decrees．But the expression is merely a Hebraism， and it is clear from the context that the only meaning is，that the kingdom of heaven was all along prepared for those，who should approve themselves worthy of acceptance by the per－ formance of those good works（a specimen of which is subjoined）which invariably spring from a true faith．God＇s purpose was this， （says Dr．A．Clarke），to admit none into his kingdom but such as were made partakers of his holiness．The $\kappa \lambda \eta$ povopingare shows the certainty of the thing，as being due，by the promise of God．
 complete phrase occurs in 2 Sam．ii．27．and Judg． xix．18．The difference between the Classical and Hellenistic use is this，that in the latter it is used of one only，in the former of more than one．
36．$\gamma v \mu \nu \dot{\partial} \mathrm{~s}]$ The term here（like the corres－ ponding one in most languages，antient and modern）does not denote absolutely naked，but ＂without some of one＇s garments，＂or generally ill clothed．＇Ereテкíqaनीe．The word signifies 1st，to look at，survey ；2d，to look after，imply－ ing attendance，care，and relief．Thus it is used of both the attendance of a physician，and of a nurse or friend．＂H $\lambda \theta$ ere $\boldsymbol{\pi} \rho \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ ．$\mu$ e．This，like the Latin adire，implies solace and comfort．
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#### Abstract

38. то́re $\sigma \dot{d}]$ Raphael observes that the $\delta \dot{d}$ is not adversative, but copulative. It is not, however, simply such, but may be rendered moreover, or again.  unto me, as doing it by my order.' Our Lord is pleased to regard what is done to his disciples, whether for good or evil, as done to himself. See Math. x. 12. and Acts xiv. 4. 41. alcinvon.] Considering the opinions of the Jews, and indeed of the antients in general, (which see in Recens. Synop.), our Lord's hearers could not fail to understand this word in the usual sense everlasting, and not (as some ancient and modern Commentators contend) in that of a very long, but limited duration. And this seems to me one of the strongest arguments against an interpretation which has no solid foundation. The inferences which have been drawn (see Dr. Hale's Analys. Vol. iIi. p. 575. and Bp. Butler there cited) from the use of   Hell was not originally designed for men, and that they are the authors of their own miseries, are quite unfounded, because deüte could not have been used to the rejected, and among the oi arye入ou sou dıaßólou may be included the incorrigibly bad of every age.


44. aúTū.] This is not found in most of the best MSS. and Versions, and some Fathers; nor has it any place in the Ed. Princ. It was cancelled by Beng., Wets., Math., and Scholz.
XXVI. 2. үiveтat.] Said to be for ajerat, ' is to be celebrated,' (a frequent sense of the present tense; ) which, however, is not only a Hebraism, but (as Raphel shows) a Grecism also. Ma $\chi^{\alpha}$, the paschal feast. The word is derived from the Heb. פטו a passing by, from nOs, to pass, pass by. And in the Sept. and the New Testament $\tau \delta \pi \alpha \sigma \chi \alpha$ signifies 1. the paschal lamb; 2. the paschal feast. Kali od vide. The cal presents some difficulty, which can only be removed by taking it in sens xpoyıкй, for cal тóre. It is often used for öte, which may admit of being resolved into cal то́тє. That his death impended, our Lord had repeatedly apprised his disciples; but he had not until now told them the exact time. Mapaoídotat, 'is to be betrayed.'
45. Tóre] i. e. on the second day before the
 for rd ouvédoiov, as that assembly is called in Joh. x. 47., and whose office it was to sit in judgment on false prophets. Aud $\lambda \nu$. The word signifies 1. an open enclosure; 2. an area, or court yard, such as was before the vestibule of a large house; 3. an interior court, such as is in the












middle of Oriental houses: 4. by synecdoche, an edifice provided with such an aid $\eta$; and was a name given to the residences of Kings or great persons, denoting mansion or palace.
 $\Delta o ̈ \lambda c \varphi$. The Commentators supply du or oúv. But no ellipsis is necessary, as the Dative form of itself will express the instrument or means.
 eop ofy is meant, not the feast-day, but the whole paschal festival. The three great paschals, indeed, were periods when notoriaus malefactors were usually executed, for the sake of more public example. This, however, the Sanhedrim would have waived, but having so fair an offer made by Judas, they embraced the opportunity.
46. इímovos roù $\lambda e \pi \rho o u ̄$.$] So called by sur-$ name, because he had been a leper, and had probably been cured by Christ. So Matthew was called the Publican, because he had been such.
 been no little debate on the question, whether the transaction related here and in Mark xiv. 3-9., be the same with that recorded in Joh. xii. 2., or a different one. It is impossible, in a work of this nature, to enter into long discussions, especially of this nature ; the reader is therefore referred, on the latter hypothesis, to Lightfoot and Pilkington; on the former, to Doddr., Michaelis, Recens. Synop., Fritz., and especially Townsend Ch. Arr. i. 387 ., with whom I entirely agree. There is no great weight in the allegations of discrepancies between the two stories; while their points of agreement are so remarkable that they cannot well be regarded as two different transactions, but have every appearance of being two statements by two different eye-witnesses of the same transaction. It cannot, indeed, be denied, that one or other of the two narratives must be inserted out of the strict chronological order, which, it should seem, there is greater reason to think is observed by John, than by Matthew and Mark. The contrary position, however, is maintained by Abp. Newcome, and especially by Bp. Marsh, with his usual ability, but perhaps with less than his usual succes.
 a cruse of ointment, which (as we learn from
the writers on Antiquities ) was much of the form of our oil flasks, with a long and narrow neck. The utensil was so called, because it had been first, and was always generally made of a sort of marble called onyx, from being of the colour of a human nail; and also alabaster, not from the Arabic Bet straton, as some imagine, but I conceive, from the extreme smoothness, and consequently difficulty of handling articles made of it. The common derivation from a privative and $\lambda a \beta \eta$, a handle, from the flasks having no handles, is quite puerile. Thus the utensil came to be called d $\lambda^{\alpha} \beta a \sigma$ orpov, which it is probable was originally an adjective, with the ellip. of $\sigma \kappa$ evios. Afterwards, however, it came to be manufactured of any materials, as glass, metal, stone, and even wood. In the phrase a $\lambda \alpha^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \beta a \sigma$ roou $\mu$ úpov (which is found in Herodot. iiI. 20. and Athen. 268.) there is the same ellipse of $\pi \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu$.

Mark and John call this múptov, nard, which, as appears from Heyn. on Tibull. ii. 27., was rather an oil than an unguent, and therefore (especially as the term кavéxєev just after demands this) we may suppose that such is the sense of $\mu \dot{u} \rho$. here.

- $\beta a \rho u \tau i \mu o v$,$] A word used by the later$ Greek writers, equivalent to wo入úт_Mos, which is used by John, or todure入irs, used by Mark. Karéxeev èml tiv кeф. The Classical construction is катéx. катd тıvos, or кат́x. тıvos. This was a usual mark of respect from hosts towards their guests, both among the Jews and Gentiles.
 in Theocr. Id. xv. 18. and $d^{2} \boldsymbol{0} \lambda \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda} \mu$, in Theophr. Ch. Eth. xv. and Plutarch i. 869. At els Tl sub. dott, or y'́rove, which is expressed in Mart.

9. $\tau \boldsymbol{j} \mu \dot{u} \rho o \nu$.$] The words are wanting in seve-$ ral of the best MSS., besides several Versions and Fathers; and are cancelled by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz. They seem to have come from the margin, where they were intended to supply a substantive to which toüto might be referred, and were introduced from Joh. xin. 5.
10. тí ко́жоиs жаре́хете.] Пapixєıע is not unfrequently used with an Accus. of a noun, importing labour or exertion; but almost always in the singular, with the exception of $\pi \rho \bar{\alpha} \gamma \mu a$. which always has the plural. Eis ¿ме́. Not

11 ép







 тарабч.

pat for dy $\boldsymbol{d}_{\mathrm{mol}}$, as Ruin. imagines; but the els signifies unto.
11. тderote $\gamma \dot{\text { a jp, \&c.] The good work which }}$ was to be done soon, or never, was preferable to that of which the opportunities were constant and perpetual. (Whitby.)

- épè oe out тávr. ex.] This utterly destroys the Roman Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation.

12. $\beta$ a $\lambda_{0} \bar{\sigma} \alpha a \dot{a} \rho$ ] 'for by shedding this un-
 signifies to make preparation for burying by such observances (namely washing, laying out, anointing, embalming) as were used previously thereto. The best Commentators, from Grot. downward, are agreed that $\pi \rho d s$ s $\tau$ does not denote the intention of the woman, but of Providence. Or there may be, as some think, an ellipse of joel, (which is confirmed by the Syriac Version,) i.e. she has done it, as if for my burial. In either case the words must be regarded as suggesting the nearness of his death, and (as Grot. says) justifying what had been done by an argument a pari, that, had she expended this on his dead body, they who used such ointments could not reasonably object to it, and had therefore no ground now to do so, as be was so near death and burial.
 some, as Kuin. and Fritz., construed with the following $\lambda a \lambda \eta \theta$ nigerat; but it is usually, and more properly, taken with the preceding önov, and is well rendered by Casaub. ' in toto inquam undo.' Td eva yr. тoüto is well rendered in the Syriac version ' this my Gospel,' i. e. my religion, this religion which I am now promulgating. Bis $\mu \nu \eta \mu o ́ \sigma u v o v a i v \eta s, ~ ' f o r ~ h e r ~ h o-~$
 as its kindred terms, is almost always meant for praise.
13. тóre] i.e. about that time; for this parcuticle is of very indefinite signification, and is used with considerable latitude. The particle, however, has reference to ver. 3., and is resumpfive, and the narration of the anointing parenunetical. The $\tau$ ore does not, at all events, mean (as Kuin. and others imagine) ' when they had resolved to apprehend him,' but rather 'when they were yet unresolved whether to apprehend him then, or not.'
14. $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \sigma a v a \dot{u} \tau \underset{\varphi}{\dot{w}}$.] On the interpretation of

Ëбтทal Commentators are divided. Some antent and many modern ones explain it ' weighed out,' i. e. paid; by a reference to the antient custom of paying the precious metals by weight, which continued, or at least the mode of expression, even after the introduction of coined money. This signification of lorávat is frequent in the Sept., and in the Classical writers from Homer downward. Others, however, induced by an apparent discrepancy in Mark and Luke, the former of whom says $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \eta \gamma \gamma \epsilon i \lambda a \nu \tau o$ aúre di $\rho$ yú $\rho \stackrel{\nu}{ }$, would take it to mean promised to give. But no good authority for this signification (which indeed would be still harsher in this absolute use) has ever been adduced ; and the testimony of the antient Versions will afford confirmation, since they rather give the sense appointed than promised, and that may possibly be the true one. Nor is the discrepancy in question so material as to need being got rid of in so violent a manner. For, without resorting to the arbitrary supposition of Michaelis and Rosenm., that the money in question was only an earnest of more, we may maintain that the term used by Mark, (which only means engaged to give,) and that used by Luke, (which only means agreed up,) may either of them be said, in such a case, to imply immediate payment at the treasury. That the money was paid, we find from Math. xxvii. 3-5.
 brought to the consideration of a question on which Commentators are much divided in obinon ; namely, whether our Lord partook of the Passover before his crucifixion, and if so, at what time? There are expressions in the Evangelists which seem at first sight contradictory. John appears to differ from the rest respecting the time that the Jews partook of the Passover; and supposes they did not eat it on the same evening as our Saviour; yet they all agree that the night of the day in which he eat what was called the passover, was Thursday. He is also said to command his disciples to prepare the passover, and he tells them he had earnestly desired to eat this passover with them. Yet we find that on the day after that on which he had thus celebrated it, the Jews would not go into the judgment hall, lest they should be defiled, but that they might eat the passover. Now the law required that all should eat it on the same
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day. The chief solutions which have been devised of this controverted question are as follows: 1. That our Lord did not eat the Passover at all. Of those who adopt this opinion some contend that it is only a common supper that is spoken of; others, that Jesus (like the Jews of the present day) celebrated only a memorative, not a sacrificial, Passover. 2. That he did eat the Passover, and on the same day with the Jews. 3. That he did eat it, but not on the same day with the Jews, anticipating it by one day. Of these solutions, the first, in both its forms, is alike inconsistent with the plain words of Scripture, фayeì $\tau \delta$ ráo $\chi a$ and $\theta v \in i ̄ \nu$ rd
 over, rests merely on conjecture; and the place, the preparation, and the careful observance of the Paschal feast alike forbid the notion of a common, or of a memorative supper. As to the second solution, it is equally inadmissible, since, on that hypothesis (as Mr. Townsend says) "if our Lord ate it the same hour in which the Jews ate theirs, he certainly could not have died that day, as they ate the passover on Friday, about six o'clock in the evening. If he did not, he must have been crucified on Saturday, the Jewish sabbath, and could not have risen again on the first day of the week, as the Evangelists testify, but on Monday." The third solution (which has been supported by Scaliger, Casaub., Capell., Grot., Bochart, Hamm., Cudw., Carpzov, Kidder, Ernesti, Michaelis, Rosenm., Kuin., Bens., A. Clarke, Townsend, and many other eminent Commentators) is alone worthy of being adopted, since it is most consistent with the language of the Evangelists, and best reconciles any seeming discrepancies. See it fully detailed in my Recens. Synop. and Townsend. The Passover was to commence on the first full moon in the month Nisan; but from the inartificial and imperfect mode of calculation arising from reckoning from the first appearance of the moon's phasis, a doubt might exist as to the day; and this doubt afforded ground occasionally for an observance of different days, which it is said the Rabbinical writings recognize. And as the Pharisees and Sadducees differed on so many other points, so it is likely that they should on the present. And this disagreement would, it is obvious, make a day's difference in the calculation, which difference would extend throughout the whole month; so that what would to one party be the 14th day, would to the other be the 13th. Of course, the error in this diversity of observance
must rest, not with our Lord, but with the Jews who differed from the order which he adopted, namely, the Pharisees. They might defer, but our Lord would not anticipate the day dv $\bar{\eta}$ モ́del $\theta \dot{v} \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau \dot{d} \pi a ́ \sigma \chi a$.

Thus every real difficulty, as far as the subject admits of it, is solved.
18. $\tau d \nu \delta \in i \in \nu a$,] This expression was used both by the Classical and Hellenistic writers (as we say Mr. Such-a-one or Mr. You-know-who, and the Spaniards fullano) in speaking of a person whose name one does not recollect, or think it worth while to mention, but who is well known to the person addressed. Many reasons have been imagined for Jesus's suppressing the name, which has been variously reported by Ecclesiastical tradition. It was a person who, our Lord knew, would be ready to accommodate him with a room, and with whom he had, no doubt, previously arranged the matter.

- $\delta$ каıров $\mu$ оv. $]$ Schmid, Rosenm., Kuin., and some others, take кaıpos to denote the timo of keeping the passover; and the $\mu o v$, they think, refers to the different day on which Jesus, with the Karei and others, kept it, from that of the Pharisees. But though this interpretation may seem countenanced by the words following, yet it presents so frigid a sense that there is no reason to abandon the usual interpretation, by which кatpos is explained the time of Christ's passion and death. So Ps. xxxi. 17. "my time is in thine hand." Thus the full sense will be, 'The time for my departure is near, previous to which it is necessary that I should celebrate the Passover, which I will do at that house.' This use of motsiv is found also in the Classical writers. And so facere in Latin. Mós $\sigma e$, apud te.

19. ทivoi $\mu a \sigma \alpha \nu$ т̀ $\pi \alpha \sigma \chi \alpha$.] This is usually rendered, "they prepared the paschal lamb." But it rather seems to signify, 'they made ready for the paschal meal,' such as providing and examining the lamb, slaying, skinning, and roasting it.
20. \&עéкecto.] Though the Passover was directed to be eaten standing, (Exod. xii. 11.), yet the Doctors had introduced the reclining posture, (which had been usual at meals from antient times), accounting it a symbolical action, typifying that rest and freedom to which, at the institution of the rite, they were tending, but had now attained.
 omitted through delicacy.
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 airw̄ $\Sigma \dot{v}$ єाтas．




23．ì $\dot{\dot{\varepsilon}} \mu \beta \dot{\alpha} \psi a s$ \＆c．］The Commentators are not agreed whether this was meant to designate the betrayer，or whether it was only a prophet－ ical application of a proverbial saying，importing that one of his familiar companions should be－ tray him，and not meant to be applied particu－ larly，except by the person himself intended． The former opinion seems preferable．Theo－ phyl．and Grot．think that Judas reclined near Christ，so that，though there were more dishes on the table，（and on a Passover table there were several small dishes，each containing the juice of the bitter herbs，of which every one dipped his bread into the one nearest to him）yet he ate from the same dish．Thus might Jesus more easily（and without the others hearing）have answered the interrogation of Judas by the words ＂thou hast said ；＂and thus John，at the instance of Peter，asking who the traitor should be，have received a certain sign from Jesus．＂Yet the disciples（except perhaps John，see Joh．xiii． 26 ．， and Judas，who pretended ignorance）did not at the time，nor until Judas＇s departure，understand who was meant．

The custom of several taking food or sauce with the hand from the same dish is Oriental，and still in use in the East．

24．úxd́y $\ell_{l}$ ］is going．The present tense is used to denote the nearness of the things pre－ dicted．There is，too，an euphemism，＇is going （unto death）；＇such as is common to most lan－ guages，in words denoting to depart，and of which the Commentators adduce examples both from the Sept．and the Classical writers．Thus in the Anthol．Gr．vii． 169 ．we have the complete phrase

 Prophecies of the Old Testament．Compare Ps．xxii．1－3．Is．liii．8．Dan．ix．26．Zach．xii． 10．\＆xiii．7．Ka入dy－dyevvit $\theta_{\eta}$ ．A form of expression employed by the antients to express a condition the most miserable，of which exam－ ples are adduced by Lightf．，Schoettg．，Wets．， and Kypke．The most apposite is Schemoth $R$ ． 640．p．135．＂He that knoweth the Law，and doeth it not，it were better for him that he had not come into the world．＂

25．$\sigma \dot{v}$ eixas．］A form of entire assent and serious affirmation，found not only in Hebrew， but also in Greek and Latin writers．
 mentators render，＇when they had eaten；＇which sense seems to be required by 1 Cor．xi．25．цeтa Td deırviñac．But beotónten scarcely admits
of that sense；and the seeming discrepancy may be removed by a mutual conformation，rendering the former expression＇while they were yet eat－ ing，＇（i．e．，as Rosenm．translates，towards the end of the supper）and the latter，＇as they had just finished the paschal feast．＇
 of some MSS．，would cancel the $\tau \delta \nu$ ；an altera－ tion which he thinks called for by the absence of the $\tau \dot{\delta} \nu$ in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke．But it is more probable that the $\tau \dot{\nu}$ should have been cancelled by those who wished to conform the text of Matthew to that of the other Evangelists ；which however is not neces－ sary ；since，though the sense with the Article is more definite，（i．e．the loaf，or rather cake， thin and hard，and fitter to be broken than cut） yet it would be intelligible without it．That two cakes of unleavened bread were provided for the Passover，all the accounts testify ；though as only one was broken by our Lord，it is no wonder that in the new ordinance founded on the Jewish rite， only one（and that large or smaller in proportion to the probable number of communicants）should be furnished．This may serve as a satisfactory justification of $\tau d \nu$ ，which I am not aware that any Editor has even suspected of being spurious． Schoiz very properly regards the omission of it as an Alexandrian alteration．
－euxapıoviéras］It is not easy to imagine stronger authority of MSS．，Versions，Fathers， and early Editors，than that which exists for this reading，（instead of the common one eì $10 \gamma{ }^{\prime} \sigma a s$ ） which has been with reason adopted by Wets．， Matth．，and Scholz．The common one is，how－ ever，retained and defended by Griesb．and Fritz．， whose reasons，however，seem light，when weighed against such predominant evidence．From the term evxaptovinias the rite afterwards took its name，especially as the service was a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving．It was customary among the Jews never to take food or drink without returning thanks to God，the giver，in prayer，by which it became sanctified．＂Eк入are． Namely，as a type of the breaking of the body of our Redeemer on the cross．Hence it appears that the breaking of the Sacramental bread is too significant a part of the ceremony to authorize it to be omitted，as is done by the Roman Catho－ lics．
－ $\mathbf{z} \sigma \tau t]$ All the best Commentators are agreed that the sense of $k \sigma \pi t$ is represents，or signifies； an idiom common in the Hebrew，which wanting a more distinctive term，made，use of the verb








to be；a simple form of speech，yet subsisting in the common language of most nations．See Gen．xl．12．xli．26．Dan．vii．23．viii． 21. 1 Cor．x．4．Gal．iv．24．Thus the Jews answered their children，who asked respecting the Pass－ over，what is this？This is the body of the lamb which our fathers eat in Egypt．Wets．truly observes，that while Christ was distributing the bread and wine，the thought could not but arise in the minds of the disciples，What can this mean，and what does it denote？They did not inquire，whether the bread which they saw were really bread，or whether another body lay uncon－ spicuously hid in the interstices of the bread，but what this action signified？of what it was a repre－ sentation or memorial ？

27．Td тотipiov］Some few MSS．have not the ró．But the authority both external and internal for the Article is so great that it must be retained．See Bp．Middlet．Hence it should seem that one cup only was used；for（as ob－ serves Middlet．）though four cups of wine were to be emptied at different times during the cere－ mony，a single cup four times filled was all that the occasion required．Which of the four is here meant，Commentators are not agreed．It is generally supposed to have been the third，or the cup of blessing，which was regarded as the most important of the four．That the wine was mixed with water all are agreed，and this the Romanists still scrupulously retain，though they boldly violate the next injunction rieve $₫ \xi \in$ aüroû тávтes，by confining the cup to the Clergy，（as if the words were meant for the Apostles only） notwithstanding that this view is utterly for－ bidden by the reason subjoined why all are to drink of it，and in spite of the strong authority of Antiquity in the practice of the Church up to a comparatively recent period．

28．Toúтo үaj－dıa0 $\eta \kappa \eta \mathrm{s}$ ］＇For this my blood， by which the new covenant is ratified．＇So Luke：
 $\mu o v$ ，By the administration of this cup I insti－ tute a new Religion，to be ratified by my blood．＇ In the federal sacrifices of the antients it was（as Grot．and Hamm．show）usual to receive the blood in a vessel，which was（as they prove by the Historians）drunk by the more barbarous nations；but by the more civilized wine was substituted for it，to which the colour（the wine of the East being red）would contribute；and wine is by certain poets called the blood of the grape．Hence our Lord is by some thought to have had a reference to this．
－éкхиуóuevov els áф．$\dot{\alpha} \mu$ ．］Here（as Grot． remarks）there is a transition from the idea of federal to that of piacular sacrifices，in which the victim was offered up in the place of the man，
who had deserved death．＇Eкxuv．is，as Grot． remarks，present for proximate future，＇now being（i．e．to be）shed．＇Of this examples are frequent．Mepl is here put for ن́же́p，as in Matt． ix．36．；and the $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \omega_{0} \nu$ is supposed to be for rávtwy，as Matt．xx．28．But see the Note there．$\Delta \iota a \theta$ jikns is to be rendered，not testa－ ment，but covenant．
 these words there is great diversity of opinion． The only interpretations which have any sem－ blance of truth are 1．that of those who suppose that our Lord intended by a strong figure to pre－ pare his disciples for his departure，which would prevent his participation in any future solemnity， until，at the end of the world，they should enjoy happiness together in heaven．The supporters of this interpretation adduce examples of that sense of calvós．But they are by no means apposite；and although in Scripture it is not unusual to represent felicity by images borrowed from a feast，yet the interpretation is frigid and liable to several objections．Unless，indeed， we might regard кaıvdv as put advérbially for anew．But that mode of explanation（though $I$ find it supported by Fritz．）is deficient in autho－ rity．Greatly preferable is the interpretation of the antient and many eminent modern Commen－ tators，as Camer．，Gataker，and recently Kuin．
 т $о$ ó $\varphi$, in a new and different manner，i．e．in a spiritual one，namely，by being virtually present in the celebration of the Sacrament．Thus $\beta$ ari－入eia roû marpòs $\mu$ ov（which must be explained in accordance with the plainer and more usual form in the parallel passage of Mark Barı入cia roü $\Theta e o u ̄$ ）will denote，＇until my religion（i．e． the Gospel dispensation）is established．＇And this is placed beyond doubt by the parallel passage of Luke écos öтоv ท̀ ßaбı入єía той Өcoй e $\lambda \theta \boldsymbol{n}$ ．Thus the interpretation of many recent Commentators who take $\beta a \sigma$ ．rou marpds $\mu$ ov to signify Heaven，is to be rejected．I must not omit to observe that this use of $\alpha \pi \alpha \alpha^{\prime}$ t is Hel－ lenistic．See Lobeck on Phrynich．The expres－
 for wine，occurring not only in the Sept．，bus （at least with a slight change）in the Classical writers ；e．gr．Pind．Nem．ix．23．duжé入ov mais． Anacr．Od．1．7．रóvos ג́بтé入ou．
30．i i $\mu$ jiбavtes ］＇having sung a hymn，＇i．e． either one alapted to the rite which Christ had just instituted（so the Christian hymn mentioned at Acts iv．24．）or，as most Commentators think， the usual hymn called кат＇¿Eox ${ }^{\prime} \nu$ the Hallel， which comprised the 113th and four following Psalms．Whether it was sung，or recited，is not clear from the term employed；but from the








 eixov.

Rabbinical researches of Lightf., the former is the more probable.
31. $\sigma x a v \delta^{2} \lambda \iota \sigma \theta \dot{j} \sigma \in \sigma \theta$ ] i. e. (as Euthym. ex-
 proun фєúそeo日e, ye shall fall away from, forsake me.
 though with a slight, but very unimportant, variation from the Heb. and Sept. It is there said of an evil shepherd; but, as Whitby remarks, our Lord applies the passage to himself rather as an argument a fortiori than a prediction. Most recent Commentators (from Grot.) think that this is a procerbial expression, of which they adduce examples. But those will only show that there was a similar proverbial expression, not that this is such; which is inconsistent with the as $\gamma$ éypaxtat, by which is indicated a quotation from the Old Testament. The true reaating in the Sept. is, no doubt, $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau a \xi o v$, (found in many of the best MSS.) But as the terminations $\infty$ and ov are very similar, especially in MSS., so I doubt not but that $\pi a \tau a \xi_{\infty}$ was a frequent, perhaps the common, reading in the time of Christ. This is much better than supposing, with Owen and Randolph, that the Hebrew is corrupted; for although the first person is not inapplicable in the Evangelist, yet it is quite unsuitable in the Prophet.
32. Tpoá $\xi_{\omega} \dot{\operatorname{j} \mu \hat{\alpha} s}$ ] Here there is a continuation of the pastoral metaphor of the preceding verse, to be understood (as I pointed out in Recens. Synop.) by bearing in mind the Oriental custom of the Shepherd not following, but leading the sheep, which is alluded to in Joh. $x$. 4. Roeenm. and Kuin. think that the sense of Tpoágo must not be pressed on, since all that is meant is, I will see you again in Galilee, expect me in Galilee. There is, however, something precarious in this sort of interpretation, and I prefer supposing, that the sense (which is, as in other predictions of our Lord at this period, briefly and obscurely worded) may be as expresed by the following paraphrase (founded on Fritz.): 'On returning to life I shall precede you into Galilee,' i. e. I shall first be present in Galilee, where if you follow me, you will thereby recover your shepherd and leader.
33. el кal ndopres] The кal is wanting in most of the best MSS. and some Versions, and was rejected by Mill \& Beng., and cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittom, and Scholz; but restored by Fritz; and, I think, rightly; for Critical reacons may outweigh Manuecript au-
thority in a case, like the present, where all Manuscript authority is weak.
 Theocrit. says that $\phi$ wעeiv is properly used of the voice of birds. Yet it is perhaps never used, in any good writer, of cocks, but adect, кeкраYéval, фөéryeotal. As the Rabbinical writers have told us that cocks were Sorbidden to be kept in Jerusalem, because of the "holy things," it has been objected that Peter could not hear one crow. But (without cutting the knot by resorting to any unusual sense of $d \lambda$ écromp, or appealing to the testimony of the Talmud) we may, with Reland, maintain that the cock might crow outside of the city and yet, in the stillness of night, be heard by Peter from the house of Caiaphas, which was situated near the city wall. I wonder, however, it should not have occurred to the Commentators that the best mode of removing the difficulty would be to render, 'before cock crowing.' So Aristoph. Ecl. 391. ö́re $\tau \delta$ dev-
 were kept, or not, in Jerusalem, they, no doubt, were in the country; and this phrase, like the correspondent one in Latin, depends upon general custom.
It has been thought a contradiction, that Mark xiv. 30. says $\pi \rho l \nu \eta \eta^{n}$ dis $\phi \omega \nu \bar{\eta} \sigma a$. But there will be none, if it be considered that the heathens reckoned two cock crowings, of which the second (about day break) was the more remarkable, and was that called $\kappa a \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \xi=x \not{ }^{\prime} \nu$ the cock-crowing. Thus the sense is, ' before that time of night, or early morn, which is called the cock-crowing, (namely, the second time which bears that name) thou shalt deny me thrice.' Mark relates the thing more circumstantially; but there is no inconsistency in the two accounts. In Mark the expression a $\lambda$ éктшo d́ $\phi \dot{j} \nu \eta \sigma \epsilon$ may be rendered, 'and it was cock-crowing time;' in Luke and
 'it shall not be cock-crowing time.'
 of expression, of such frequent occurrence in the Classical writers, that it may be regarded as almost proverbial. On the use of oi $\mu \bar{\eta}$ with the Fut. Indic. see Winer's Gr. Gr. p. 160. ' $\mathbf{O} \mu \mathrm{o}$ ios $\delta \mathrm{dt}$. The dé, which is not found in the textus receptus, is supported by most of the best MSS. and some Versions and Fathers; and had place in the Ed. Princ., Cal., and the two first of Stephens (who in his third Edition threw it out, on the authority of Erasm.) ; and it has been restored by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm.,
x Mare． 14. 32. 32.
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Fritz．，and Scholz．It is，indeed，required by the proprietas lingua．
 or village，of oil presses．＇It was situated at the foot of the Mount of Olives．
 whom he had taken as witnesses of his transfigu－ ration．Avereīөal кal dojucveìv．There is a sort of climax ；for the latter is a much stronger term than the former，and signifies to be al－ most overwhelmed，and become insensible with grief．

38．d＇Inooüs．］This is introduced by Wets．， Griesb．，Matth．．Fritz．，and Scholz．，from the best MSS．，Versions，and Fathers．Пєpí入uxós－ mov，for repil．el $\mu \iota$ ；which is accounted a Hebraism：but it is found in most languages． ＂Ecos $\theta a y a i r o v$ is a not unfrequent addition to the
 See also Ps．cxiv．3．As to the nature of this agony of our Lord in the garden of Gethsemene， much has been written，but nothing certainly determined．See the various opinions detailed in Recens．Synop．To so awfully mysterious a subject we cannot approach too reverently．That this cup was not death（which some of the an－ tient interpreters understood）we may be very certain．That the agony was occasioned（as some suppose）by the Divine wrath，by our Redeemer thus bearing the sins of the world， is liable to many objections ：as is also the opi nion that our Lord had then a severe spiritual conflict with the great enemy of mankind．The deadly horror was，no doubt，produced by a variety of sorrows arising from his peculiar situa－ tion and circumstances，and which it were pre－ sumptuous too minutely to scan．Upon the whole，however，we may rest assured that our Lord＇s agony was，in some mysterious way，con－ nected with the offering of himself as a sacrifice for the sins of the world，and the procuring the redemption of mankind．

39．$\pi \rho o e \lambda \theta \omega^{\prime} \%$ Many of the best MSS．have roore $\lambda \theta \omega \nu$ ，which is received into the text by Math．and Schola，and strenuously defended by them；but on precarious grounds．The com－ mon reading has been justly restored by Griesb． and Fritz．；for it is in vain to urge MS．autho－
rity in words perpetually confounded，and none are more so than $\pi \rho o$ and $\pi \rho o s$ in composition． But even were that inadmissible，and it were in favour of mpos，yet the testimony of Versions and Fathers，all of them on the side of xpo， would here turn the scale in favour of the com－ mon reading．Besides，toos is capable of no tolerable sense，except by a most harsh ellipse．
－el duvaróv \＆．］For we are（says Grot．）to distinguish between what is impossible per se， and what is impossible hoc vel illo pacto．Now per se nothing is impossible with God，except such things as are in themselves inconsistent，or else are repugnant to the Divine nature．The sense，therefore，is，＇if it be consistent with the counsels and methods of thy Providence for the salvation of men．＇Thus the words are perfectly reconcilable with those of the parallel passage of Mark xiv．36．távта duvatá бol．Similar sentiments are quoted from the Classical writers． In таре入өétw－тd тотท́pton there is（as ap－ pears from the Classical citations）a figure de－ rived from a cup being carried past any one at a feast．

40．oütcos］＇itane？siccine？＇This，like eita and some other particles，is so used with interro－ gations as to denote wonder mixed with censure． Wets．cites Hom．I1．3．23．\＆Od．e． 204.
41．रрףүорєite］＇be circumspect and watch－
 $\phi \mu \pi i \pi \tau \in \omega$ in 1 Tim．vi．9．，to denote fall under， succumb．Our Lord does not direct them to pray to God that no temptation might befall them， but that they might not be overcome by the temptations in which they must be involved； and to pray for extraordinary spiritual assistance under them．This view is confirmed by the opi－ nign of the antient and the best modern Interpret－ ers．Td $\mu \delta \nu \pi \nu \epsilon \bar{u} \mu \alpha-$ divecvirs．This is meant not as an excuse for their frailty，but as an incen－ tive to greater vigilance together with prayer．

42．тá入ıv ek deutépov．］Some would refer
 to $\tau \rho o \sigma \eta \dot{\xi} \xi \alpha \tau 0$. But the Classical examples adduced by the Commentators show that the words must be taken together．Yet there is not （as they imagine）a pleonasm，but a stronger expression．





















 ellipse is rarely supplied. Bapúvectas is often used of the heaviness of sloep, as graves oculos in Latin.
45. кaөeúdere $\tau d$ 入oเжóv.] This seems so inconsistent with the subsequent exhortation dyeipeote! ä $\gamma \omega \mu e \nu$ ! that many Commentators take the sentence interrogatively, 'do ye yet sleep ?' But this is contrary to the usus loquendi, (as Fritz. shows), which will not permit $\tau \delta$ $\lambda$ ocudy to be taken in any other sense than 'in ceterum tempus.' The best interpretation seems to be that of Chrysost. \& Euthym., (adopted by Eracm., Beza, Grot., and some recent Commentators, as Schmid. and Fritz.), which supposes a kind of ironical rebuke; q. d. ['Since you have thus far failed to watch] sleep on the remainder of the time, and take your rest [if you can]:' If irony be thought unsuitable to the occasion (though Campb. pronounces it very natural) we may, with Theophyl., Rosenm., and Kuin., take the imperatives permissively, 'I no longer desire you to, watch;' 'you can no longer render me service.' 'H $\omega \rho a$, scil. $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \pi a \rho \alpha-$ dooíar, as Euthm. rightly supplies. The кal following signifies when, or in which, by what some call a Hebraism; though it is found in Herodot., Thucyd., and other of the best Greek writers.

- iцартшл $\left.{ }^{\circ} \boldsymbol{\nu}\right]$ i.e. the Romans, as being heathens. Others, less probably, take it of the Jears. It may, however, be understood of both; which is countenanced by the omission of the Article.

47. छí $\lambda_{\infty \nu v}$ ] lignorum, sudium, clubs and such like tumultuary weapons. Such, however, would
scarcely have been borne by Roman soldiers; though John xviii. 3. speaks of a Roman $\sigma \pi \in i \overline{\rho a}$. That expression, however, must be understood in a more general sense of less than a cohort. And these might be stationed at some little distance, to aid the civil power, which was likely to be accompanied with a considerable mob.
48. $\epsilon \grave{\partial} \omega \kappa \epsilon \nu$ ] 'had given.' $\Phi 1 \lambda \eta$ n' $\omega$. Agreeably to the customary mode of salutation in antient times, especially in the East, and which is still retained in Spain and some parts of Italy.
49. катєфi久 $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \nu$.] In the Classical writers the кaтa is usually intensive, as, indeed, some take it here. But in the Sept. both the simple and compound are used indifferently to express the same Hebrew word.
50. $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \alpha i \bar{\rho} \epsilon$.] This is best regarded as a common form of address, though generally implying some degree of contempt, or, as here, reproach. ' $\mathbf{E} \phi^{\prime}$. $\mathbf{w}$. Most of the best MSS., together with some Fathers and early Edd., have ' $\phi^{\prime}$ ' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$, which is edited by Matthxi, Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. It is scarcely possible to determine the true reading, because this signification of purpose is expressed both by the Dative and the Accus. Yet if the phrase occurred in a Classical writer, I should not hesitate to edit ' ' $\phi$ ' $\mathbf{\omega}$; for I am not aware of any unimpeachable examples of the simple ös in this sense used in the Accus., but many of the Dative. The case is different with respect to the compounds ö $\sigma \tau \iota s$, ö $\sigma \pi \pi \rho, \& c$. There Classical use employs the Accus., not the Dative.
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in the LXX．Máxalpay．This denotes a large knifé or cutlass，such as travellers in Judæa used to carry for security，against the robbers， who infested the country．＇A феїлє，for $d \boldsymbol{\pi} \dot{\prime} \tau \rho \mu \epsilon$ ； an Alexandrian or Hellenistic use；for except the N．T．and LXX，it has only been adduced from Polyænus．It is，however，found in the Latin auferre，and in the common dialect of our own language．Td $\dot{\text { otcoov}}$ ．This certainly sig－ nifies the whole ear，and not the tip of it（as Grot．thinks）；for that is inconsistent with the ous in the parallel passage of Luke．Besides， wition is not unfrequently used in the LXX for oùs．And，as Lobeck on Phryn．p．211，observes， the common dialect calls most parts of the body
 senm．and Kuin．remark that the sense of $d \phi \in \hat{i} \lambda_{e}$ must not be pressed on，since from the language of Luke we may infer that the ear hung by the skin．And certainly such kind of hyperbolical idioms are common in every language．
 and several modern Commentators consider these words as a prediction of the destruction of the Jews，who took up the sword unjustly against Christ and his disciples．But this，though coun－ tenanced by Revel．xiii．10．，is a somewhat harsh interpretation；and it seems better to adopt that of Elsn．，Campb．，Kuin．，and Fritz．，who consider it as a proverbial saying against repelling force by force，and the exercise of private vengeance； importing that those who shall defend themselves by the sword，will，or may，perish by the sword． Of course，it must be taken with restriction as it regarded the disciples，and be here applied to those who take up the sword against the ma－ gistrate．Perhaps，however，a double sense may have been intended，lst for caution，（including admonition，that swords were not the weapons by which the Messiah＇s cause was to be de－
fended）；and 2dly，by way of prediction，which would suggest the best argument for non－resist－ ance．
53．$\hat{\eta}$ doкeis \＆c．］The connexion seems to be this：＇Or［if that argument will not avail，take this，that I need not thy assistance，for］thinkest thou，＇\＆c．The argument in this and the follow－ ing verse is，that such conduct implied both dis－ trust in Divine Providence，and ignoranceof Scrip－ ture．＂Aptt．The term is very significant，and denotes even in this crisis．Hapaкa入َ́́at，invoke． Kal，жapactríet，＇and he would bring to my aid．＇As to the number which follows，it is bet－ ter，with some of the best Commentators，not to dwell upon it，much less deduce any inferences from it，since it only denotes a very great number．
54．＇̈́tt］Supply a＇l 入éyovact．Or，as this ellipse is so harsh，with Fiitz．，take ö́rt in the sense nam．Thus there should be a mark of interrogation after rpaфal，and a period after $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \in \nu \in ́ \sigma \theta a$ ．

56．тoüтo д̀ц－$\pi \rho о ф \eta \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ ．］Some（as Erasm．） ascribe this observation to the Evangelist ；but most others，more properly，（as appears from Mark xiv．49．）attribute it to our Lord．
57．dxriyayov xpds K．］i．e．＇after having been first taken to Annas，（as we learn from Joh．xviii．13．）in order，it should seem，to do him honour，and while the Sanhedrim was col－ lecting．＇Axáyeu is a term appropriate to lead－ ing any one to trial or execution．Kuin．observes that $\pi \rho \delta$ s is often joined with Accusative cases of pronouns and persons，to indicate the place in which the person is whose name follows．
58．Tīs $\alpha i \lambda \hat{j} \mathrm{~s}]$ the inner court of the palace．
 perhaps to suppose，with most Commentators， that they studiously sought out and suborned false witnesses．Had they done this，they would probably have tutored their witnesses better than














to be rejected even by themselves. But the meaning seems to be, that, though they professed to seek true testimony, yet they readily entertained any testimony, whether true or false, that might criminate Jesus. In fact, the judgment of the Evangelist is blended with his narrative; a sort of synchysis not unfrequent in antient writers. Thus at oix єìpov we must supply $\mu$ apтopiay, taken from чevoouapтvpiav. By ца $\rho \tau v \rho i a \nu$ is

 required by weight of Manuscript authority, and adopted by almost every Editor from Wets. downwards.
60. obx eüpoy.]. These words are wanting in some MSS., Versions, and a few Fathers, and are rejected by Campb., and cancelled by Griesb., but very properly restored by Fritz. and Scholz., since internal as well as external evidence is in their favour. As to the authority of the antient Versions, it is slender in a point of this kind. Here we have not a mere repetition, (as the Critics, who cut the words out, supposed) but an emphatical repetition.
 from Mark xiv. 58. and Joh. ii. 19., in effect a falsity, and that of suppressing some words of Christ, with the action which explained them, and adding others. By this temple our Lord plainly meant his body. If it could have been proved that Jesus had spoken irreverently of the remple, by predicting its destruction, that would have afforded ground for a charge of blasphemy, which was a capital offence. The Priest, however, found that even this testimony could scarcely afford matter for the charge, and art-
 peè is, by an usual Hebraism, for dy tpity м $\mu \dot{\text { épa. }}$
63. dEopkif( $\sigma e$ \&c.] This seems to have been the mode of administering an oath. 'O $\overline{\text { 人 } \\} \epsilon \iota \nu}$ and dछopk. are used in the LXX. to express the Heb. eay of a witness. The syntax is an Accus. of the person sworn, whether witness or criminal, and a Genit. with кara, or sometimes an Accus. without preposition of the God sworn by. As this oath of adjuration imported to bind by the
curse of the Law, it imperatively claimed a reply, when the adjuration accompanied an interrogation; and the answer thus returned was regarded as an answer on oath, in which falsity would be perjury. Thus our Lord, who had before disdained to reply to an unfounded and even absurd charge, (especially before judges who had predetermined to find him guilty) now thought himself bound to answer, for an example to others of reverence to such a solemn form.

- $\dot{\delta}$ Xpıords, $\dot{\delta}$ viòs toū $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in o \bar{v}$.] Grot. and Whitby remark, that from this and other passages, (as Matth. xvi. 16.), it is clear that the Jews expected their Messiah to be Son of God, (interpreting the 2 d Psalm as said of him) which title, it is certain, they understood as implying divinity, otherwise the High Priest could not have declared the assumption of it to be blasphemy. See more in Bp. Blomfield's Dissertation on the knowledge of a Redeemer before the advent of our Lord, p. 115.

64. $\sigma \dot{\text { u }}$ eIxas.] A form of respectful, yet strong, asseveration. $\Pi \lambda \eta \nu$, moreover.', $\mathbf{A \pi}$ ' đ $\rho \tau t$, for áxd $\tau o u ̄ ~ v u ̄ \nu, ~(u s e d ~ b y ~ L u k e), ~ w h i c h, ~$ by a slight accommodation, may mean $\mu$ етá $\mu$ uxpdv, as Euthym. here explains. The words following have reference to the sublime description of the Messiah's advent in Dan. vii. 13 \& 14. See Matth. xxiv. 30. and Note. Ms is modestly omitted. At tท̂s duvá $\mu e \cos s u b$. тoū Өeoū, which is sometimes erpressed. By this must, by a usual Hellenistic idiom, (see Heb. i. 3. viii. 1. 1 Pet. iv. 14.), founded on Hebrew, be understood the Almighty. The advent here meant must signify, primarily at least, the coming of Christ to take vengeance on the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem.
 among the antients to express the more violent passions, especially grief and indignation, by rending the garments, either partly, or from top to bottom: or sometimes from bottom to top. See the Classical and other citations in Recens. Synop.

- ide.] Said by the Commentators to be put for idere. But it is better to consider it as an adverb like lôoú. So Joh, xix. 14. iठé ó $\beta a \sigma i \lambda e u ̀ s$ $\dot{\nu} \mu \bar{\nu} \nu$.
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66. êvoxos $\theta$ avaíou] "Evoxos (derived from the preterite middle of $\varepsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \chi \omega$ is equivalent to èvexóuevos, and signifies, 1 . being held fast by, bound to, 2. being subject, or liable. In this latter sense it is used properly with the Dative, (as in the LXX. and New Testament, and also the Classical writers. See Matth. Gr. Gr. 6 347.), sometimes with the Genit., as in the present passage and Mark iii. 29. and occasionally the Classical writers; in which syntax there is commonly thought to be an ellipse of крiдaтt. But it should rather seem that the construction, which occurs also in the Classical writers, is akin to that of Plato. Apolog. p. 83. тıцāтaı $\mu \circ \iota \dot{o}$ d̀ $\nu \eta{ }_{j} \rho$ $\theta a v a ́ \tau o v$.
67. غ̀иéтtvaav-aùroû,] A mode of expressing the deepest contempt and abhorrence, common both to antient and modern times. 'Eколd-
 is this difference in signification, that the former denotes to thump, the latter to slap.
68. т $\rho о ф \dot{\dagger} \tau е \cup \sigma о \nu ~ \dot{\eta} \mu і \nu, ~ \& c c$.] To understand this, it is proper to bear in mind (what we learn from Mark and Luke) that Christ was blindfolded when these words were pronaunced, in which there was a taunt on his arrogating the title of Messiah, and a play on the double sense of $\pi \rho о ф \eta \tau \in \dot{e} \epsilon \nu$, which, as also $\mu$ аут often used in a sense corresponding to our guess, and that is here the exact signification.
69. $\left.{ }^{\prime} \xi_{\infty}{ }^{\infty}\right]$ i.e. without the place where Jesus was examined by the council, which was the vestibule, called by Mathew múncov, by Mark жepıaíAcov. Пaıòioky. The word properly signifies a girl; but, as in our own language, it is often in later Greek used to denote maid servant. This is by Joh. xviii. 17. styled $\eta$ ovpopoós. And indeed the office of door-keeper, though among the Greeks and Romans it was confined to men, was among the Jews generally exercised by women. Kal rov, \&cc. may be rendered, 'Thou too wert one of the party with Jesus.', Blyai merd tivos often denotes to be on any one's side.
70. oúx otioa $\tau_{i} \lambda$ d'jets.]. A form expressive of
 $\lambda e ́ \gamma \in s$. For reconciliations of the seeming trifling discrepancies in various parts of the narrative, see Recens. Synop., Grot., Mackn., and Kuin.
71. "̈́tь oúk oiठa]" "OTt, like the Hebrew particles ${ }^{\circ}$ כ and $\quad א$, after verbs of swearing and affirming, denotes profecto, $\bar{\eta} \mu \eta \nu \nu$, dvтws. Thus 1 Kings i . 30 . where the Sept. has ört, and Genes. xxii. 17. xlii. 16. where in the Sept. for

 Gen. xliv. 28, the Hebrew $7 \times$ is rendered by the Sept. $\mathrm{g}^{2} \tau t$. (Kuin.) It should rather seem that there is an ellipsis of $\lambda$ é $\gamma \omega \nu$, which is implied in गो $\nu \eta \dot{j} \sigma \alpha \tau 0$.
 (or, as we say, brogue) bewrayeth thee.' Different provinces of the same country have usually their distinct idioms, accent, tone of voice, \&c., which in the remote and agricultural parts are more strongly marked. That this was the case with Galilee, we learn from the Rabbinical writers, who tell us that the speech of the Galileans was broad and rustic.
72. катауа日ецатi\}есv.] Nearly all the best and by far the greater part of the MSS. have катa0epaтí\}ecv, which was preferred by Mill, Beng., and Wets., and adopted into the text by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz. But it is not easy to see how кaтa0apari乌̌iy can either be reconciled to analogy, or yield any sense suitable to the context; for it can only mean deponere. It is, besides, destitute of any authority, except that of the Ecclesiastical writers, who plainly took it from their MSS. of the New Testament. (See Steph. Thes.) The dya might easily slip out, or be lost, by an inattention to a mark of abbreviation. Therefore the authority of MSS. has far less weight than the usus lingua. This opinion is entirely confirmed by Vat. and Fritz., who have both restored the old reading.
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XXV11. 1. $\pi$ poitas 8 de yev.] The meeting of the Sanhedrim could not be held till the morning, since the coarts of the Temple were never opened by night: nor if it had been held, could trial have been then pronounced; for among the Jews justice was required to be administered in the day time, and in pablic.
2. oviбayres] This is, on account of Joh. xviii. 12. (whence it appears that Christ had been bound before) by most Commentators supposed to be put for dedécevoy. That, however, is too violent a way of removing the discrepancy. It is better, with Elsn. and Fritz., to suppose that his bonds had been remored, daring examination, and were now again put on him.
 Josephus also; though, properly speaking, Pilate was only an id itpozos, or procurator, as Joseph. and Philo. often call him. He is styled ग讠रépळy, because be, as was not unusual in the lesser prorinces, had entrusted to him the authority of
 ministration of justice, and the power of life and death ), in subordination, however, to the President of Syria.
 the opinion of some of the antient Fathers, as well as many eminent modern Commentators, (as Whitby, Rosenm., Kuin., and A. Clarke), that Judas was partly induced to betray his master by the expectation that, as Messiah, he could pot suffer death, but would no doubt deliver himself from their hands, in some such way as he had done aforetime. But the language of our Lord, (see supra xrvi. 24. and Joh. xvii. 12.) and of Peter, Acts i. 25., forbids us to smppose that his repentance was sincere, or aught but the remorse of an upbraiding conscience. And we heve every reason to suppoes that, as he was originally actuated solely by avarice, so was he now posecssed wholly with despair. He could not bear the stings of remore, sharpened as they would be by the contempt and abhorrence of all good men, whether Christ's disciples, or not; Sor it is acutely remarked by Elsn., "apud improbos conscientia, vigilare non solet, nisi quum res sit conclamata."

- dте́orpaqe] returned. An Hellenistic use of the word.
 nification found in the LXX. and Philo. p. $83 \mathrm{~m}_{\text {. }}$
 $\alpha^{2} \theta$ cos properly, and aways in the Classical writers, signifies impunis, the not being liable
 $\Sigma \dot{v}$ ö $\psi \in$, thou wilt, or ought to see to that; be that thy care. A Latinism from tu videris, for which the Greeks used $\sigma o l \mu \epsilon \lambda e ́ \tau \omega$, or adopted the Imperative.

5. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \omega^{\circ} \nu d \pi \eta \gamma \xi a \tau o$.] The plain sense of the words would seem to be, 'he went and hanged himself;' for many examples of the phrase have been adduced both from the LXX. and the Classical writers. And this sense is supported by the antient Versions. Since, however, it has been thought inconsistent with the account given by Peter (Acts i. 18.) of the death of Judas, many methods of interpretation have been devised, to reconcile this discrepancy. These are fully detailed in Recens. Synop., and reasons given why no one of them can be admitted. 1 am still of opinion that there is nothing to authorize us to desert the common signification of $d \pi \dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi$ ©cofal, (wherein the reflectad sense is to be notuced, on which see Thucyd. iii. 81. and my Note there), nor any reason to suppoee but that Judas hanged himself. The best mode of reconciling the apparent discrepancy is, to suppose (with Casaub., Raphel, Krebs, Kuin., Schleusn., and Fritz.) that after he had suspended himself, the rope breaking, or giving way, (from the noose slipping, or otherwise), he fell down headlong and burst asunder, so that his bowels protruded. So in a Rabbinical writer cited by Wets. on Acts i. 18. quidam de tecto in plateam decidit, et ruptus est venter, et viscera ejus effuxerunt. The xplvis in the passage of Acts may be taken, like our headlong, simply of falling down from a high place, as in the examples adduced in Recens. Synop. And this view is confirmed hy the expression of Peter d ddenoes, which implies falling from on high. Thus, according to the above Commentators, the narration of the Gospel is completely reconciled with that in the Acts, by supposing that in the former is recorded the kind of death by which Judas sought destruction; and in the latter, that by which he made his final exit, or which at least was the ecent of the other.
signify the train of events recorded by the Evan－ gelists．So little other application has it，that the Jews themselves have always referred the words to the Messiah．
As to the mode in which the words in question are to be taken，there is no reason to abandon the common interpretation，according to which тıvès must be supplied at $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\delta} \dot{\dot{v}} \boldsymbol{v i \omega} \nu \quad 1$ ．And this is confirmed by Euthym．It，indeed，involves a somewhat harsh ellipse，but not so harsh as the method Fritz．has adopted in its place，namely， to take the words of Judas．Besides，that
 Whereas，according to the common interprets－
 tical of the preceding．It is well observed by Vater，＂late rues in v．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{d}$, ut alibi in v．$\dot{\text { ex }}$ ． Conf．Math．xxiii．24．＂There may seem some difficulty in $\kappa a \theta \dot{\alpha}-\kappa \dot{v} \rho เ o s$, the best way of remove－ ing which is to suppose that these words（cortes－ bonding to ויאמר יהוה אל of the Hebrew）are left by the Evangelist unaccommodated．Camp． and others would take $\bar{\epsilon} \lambda \alpha \beta o v$ for the first per－ son，and read ésooka．Thus one might render， ＇I took the thirty shekels，（the price of him that was valued，whom they valued），from the sons of Israel，（and they gave them for the potter＇s field），as the Lord appointed me．＇But this is destitute of manuscript authority，and does such violence to the words，that no dependence can be placed on the sense thus extorted．With respect to той тетıд $\begin{gathered}\text { évou，the best Commen－}\end{gathered}$ taters regard it as taken，per metalepsin，in the sense purchased，referring to Thucyd．i．33．$\pi \rho \boldsymbol{\rho}$ $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$ र $\eta \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu-\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ．But perhaps to $\bar{a} \sigma \theta a t$ may here be used in the sense to have a price set on one＇s head．Now when it is said that the Priests agreed with Judas for 30 pieces of silver，it is implied that they offered him that sum；which，indeed，might be expected from his enquiry，What will ye give me？The crasis $\kappa a \theta \dot{\alpha}$ for $\kappa a \theta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha}$＇（i．e．кат ${ }^{\prime}$ єкєiva）is said to be found no where else．

11．$\sigma \dot{v}$ el $\dot{\partial}$ ba $\beta \sigma$ ．$\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$＇I．］i．e．＇dost thou claim to be king of the Jews．＇To this the oui $\lambda$ éyets following is a form of serious asseveration．See Note on xxvi．64．Pricæus compares the dist of Plautus．Hence may be seen the true force of our affirmatives aye and yes，which are both derived from the old French ayes．The sense
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therefore is，＇you say right，（I am a king）．＇From Job．xviii．36．it appears that this declaration was made after our Lord had said that his king－ dom was not of this world，i．e．not civil or po－ litical．

14．oùde $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu]$ A stronger expression than ousoév．

15．serai \＆غ́opт riv，\＆cc．］The Commentators are not agreed whether by ka＇єорт ${ }^{\prime}$ to understand＇at feast time，＇or，＇at the paschal feast．＇The latter opinion is thought to be proved by Joh．xviii．39．That passage，indeed， is not decisive；yet according to propriety of language，this would seem to be the best founded opinion．See Middlet．We may suppose that
 Whether the custom here mentioned was old，or new，has been debated；but with some certainty has been proved to be the later．It was pro－ bably derived either from their neighbours the Syrians，or from the Greeks and Romans，the former of whom had such a custom at their Thesmophoris，the latter at their Lectisternia．

16．＇बтíquov］＇notorious．＇The word signi－ fries 1．signatus，bearing a stamp；2．notabilis，in a good sense；3．notubilis，in a bad sense，as in the Latin famosus and nobilis．

19．Tow $\beta$ jínatos］See Recent．Synop．or Horne＇s Introd．Vol．iIi．p．131．M delves．Sub．$\gamma \in \nu$ cfo te．On the nature of the idiom see Note on Math，viii． 20.
－кат＇ồvap］It has been much debated whether this was natural，or supernatural．The
latter is maintained by the Fathers and the earlier Commentators；the former，by most of the recent Interpreters．And，indeed，we may so well account for the thing from natural causes， （especially as History has recorded many similar cases）that we are not required－perhaps scarcely warranted，to call in the supernatural．Mo 入入a， much；as often with verbs signifying to suffer．
 po is explained＇early this morning．＇And morning dreams were supposed to be most ve－ racious and ominous．

－rival］Put for $\pi \delta \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$, by an Hellenistic idiom．＇And，for ex．

23．Ti $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa \kappa \kappa \delta \nu \quad \epsilon \pi$ ．］The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is not，as some imagine，redundant；but has reference to a clause omitted，expressing or implying a re fusal of the punishment demanded， q．$^{\text {d．＇Not }}$ so，or why so，for \＆c．＇See Middlet．，Grot．，and Krebs．That this is not a Hebraism，（as some have thought）is evident from the Classical ex－ amples which have been adduced by Krebs． Пepıб立s，＇exceedingly，vehemently．＇

24．öт！oúdèv $\dot{\omega} \phi \in \lambda \in \overline{1}]$＇se nihil proficere，＇ that he is doing no good，effecting nothing． ＇Axevíqato vas xeipas．This was a symbolical action，probably of the remotest antiquity，to express being guiltless of any crime，and in use alike with Jews and Gentiles；the former using it by the direction of their Law，（see Deut．xxi． $6 \& 7$ ，and compare Ps．xxv．6．），and the latter probably from antient custom paton down
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from the Patriarchal times. So that as to the question debated by the Commentators, whether Pilate adopted the Jewish or the Heathen custom, is nugatory; although those who maintain the former position seem most in the right.

- $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$ тoù $a^{2} \mu$.] The $\alpha \pi \delta$ is added by He braism ; the true ratio of which is indicated by Fritz. Dıkaiou. The word is here, as supra ver. 19., taken by Casaub., Le Clerc, Campb., and others, in a forensic sense, i. e. innocent of the crime laid to his charge. But perhaps the forensic and ordinary sense are combined, i. e. this innocent man and just person. To the latter Pilate bore testimony in a despatch sent
 must look to that;' q. d. 'you must take the blame.'

25. тঠ̀ aโ $\mu \alpha-\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\alpha} s]$ scil. è $\lambda \theta$ érш. Similar forms of imprecation are adduced by the Commentators, both from the Rabbinical writers and the Classics. See also 2 Kings ii. 37. Blood to be upon any one, is equivalent to being accountable for any one's death. Elsn. and Wets. have proved that it was customary among the Greeks for witnesses, on whose testimony any were put to death, to devote themselves and their children to curses, if they bore false testimony. Indeed Grot. has shown that the custom was one of great antiquity.
26. фраүe入入ш; Latin fiagellare. The fagella were terribly sharp, and are termed by Horace horribilia. Scourging either with flagella (as in the case of slaves), or, (as in that of free persons) with rods; was among the Romans a prelude to capital punishment. See more in Wets. and Kuin. I have, in Recens. Synop., proved that it was in use by the Greeks in the earliest ages.
27. $\tau \delta$ траıт $\omega$ рiov] The word here denotes not that part of the camp so called, but a magnificent edifice in the upper part of Jerusalem, which had formerly been Herod's Palace, and was afterwards the abode of the Roman Procurators when they sojourned at Jerusalem; for their ordinary residence was at Cersarea.
28. $\chi^{\lambda a \mu v \delta a]}$ This was a kind of round cloak, confined on the right shoulder by a claxp,
so as to cover the left side of the body, and worn over the other garments. It was used alike by officers and privates; but, of course, with a difference in texture and dying. What is here
 and by John mopфupoüv. Yet there is no real discrepancy; for though the colours are, properly speaking, different, yet жорфироüs denoted sometimes a bright red; and hence the words
 changed. The robe here mentioned was, no doubt, a cast off sagum of some general officer.
29. $\sigma \tau \epsilon \in \alpha \nu \nu \nu \epsilon \xi \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \nu \theta \hat{\omega} \nu$.] There has been no little debate as to the nature and materials of this crown; some contending that as this, like all the rest of what was done by the soldiers, was merely in mockery of his regal pretensions, there could be no motive to cruelty; and they propose to take the word $\alpha^{2} \kappa a \nu \theta \omega \nu$ as the Genit. plural not of $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \eta$, but of áкavtos, i. e. the bear's foot, which is rather a smooth than thorny plant, and would be more convenient to plait. Those, on the other hand, who defend the common version, reply that both $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta_{\eta}$ and $\alpha^{\alpha} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu-$ Bavos often occur in the New Testament and Sept., and always in the sense thorn and thorny; and that the antient versions all confirm the common interpretation, as do some antient Fa thers, as Tertullian, and Clem. Alexandrinus. The latter interpretation is the best founded. Indeed there is (as I have observed in Recens. Synop.) the highest probability opposed to mere conjecture. Yet that this was intended to add cruelty to scorn, as a recent Commentator maintains, seems not well founded. There is great reason to think (with Theophyl. and Budzus) that the crown was not of mere therns, but of some prickly shrub, (probably acacia, though that cannot be ascertained), as in a kindred passage cited by Wets. "in capite corona subito exstitit, ex asperis herbis."

By the к $\dot{\alpha} \lambda a \mu o s$, the best Commentators understand not cane, (as Doddr.) but reed.
 Emperors, as Casar ave! In $\dot{\beta}$ Batid. the Nominative is put for the vocative, as Mark ix. 25. and Luke viii. 54. See Winer's Gr. Gr. § 22. 2.
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31．axayayoy．］A usual term for leading axay a criminal to execution．

32．¿छॄepхо́भєyol］＇as they were going out ［of the city］；＇since executions were，both among the Jews and Gentiles，conducted out－ side of the cities．＂Avtpoonov，K．This use of \＆enpontos with nouns of country，business，or office，（see Matth．Gr．Gr．§430．7．）is thought to be pleonastic，but is in reality only a vestige of the wordiness of antique phraseology．＇H $\mathbf{\gamma \gamma}{ }^{a}$ ．－ peugav，＇compelled；＇properly impressed，which implies compulsion．＇See Note on Matth．v． 41 ． It was customary for the criminal to carry his own cross，which was of the form of a T．About the middle of it was fixed a piece of wood on which the crucified person sat，or rather rode， and into which sometimes the criminal，in a bravado，leaped；for the height of the cross was （contrary to the common opinion）such as to admit of this，being only three feet from the ground．The hands were fastened to the cross piece with nails，but the feet were only tied to the post with ropes．Crucifixion can be traced back to as early as the age of Semiramis，and was a punishment chiefly inflicted on slaves，or free persons convicted of the most heinous crimes． That the corpees were left as a prey to ravenous birds，appears from Artemidorus iv．49．cited in Hecens．Synop．
33．Гo $\begin{gathered}\text { 人of } \\ \dot{\alpha} \text { ．］From the Chaldee gol－goltha，}\end{gathered}$ the second $\lambda$ being omitted，for euphony，as in Babel for Balbel．The place in question was a sort of knoll，and so called from being strewed with the skulls of executed malefactors，some－ thing like the Ceadas at Sparta，on which see my Note on Thucyd．i．134．Of the same im－ port was the name Calvaria．

For the common reading $\ddot{o}^{2}$ ，$\ddot{b}$ is found in many of the best MSS．，some antient Versions， and the Edit．Princ．，Erasm． 1 and 2；and is edited by Beng．，Matth．，Griesb．，Knapp，Tittm．， Fritz．，and Scholz．；and with reason；for：$\%$ deserves the preference，as being the more diffi－ cult reading．There can be no doubt but that the above Editors did right in retaining it ；but not，I conceive，in editing the common reading גerónevos，which can only be defended by the
precarious principle of Hypallage．Hence some MSS．change its place，or omit it，and Fritz． cancels it．But it is surely better to heal than to amputate；and I doubt not but that 入erónevov is the true reading，which is found in not a few MSS．，and is confirmed by the readings $\mu е \theta \in \rho \mu \eta \nu \in \nu o ́ \mu \in \nu=\nu$ and ка入оúдєvov，（evidently glosses），and also by the Syriac，Arabic，Persic， and Ethiopic Versions，which must have read $\lambda_{\epsilon \gamma о ́ \mu е \nu o \nu ~ o r ~}^{\mu \epsilon \theta \eta \rho \mu \eta \nu є у о ́ \mu є \nu o \nu . ~ T h e ~ c h a n g e ~}$ was produced by the vicious reading ös preced－ ing．Render＇which word is（i．e．signifies） when interpreted，Skull－place．＇This sense of入éreoөat is found also in Joh． $\mathbf{x x}$ ．16．＇Paß－
 dred passage of Matth．i．23．$\ddot{\circ} \dot{\theta} \sigma \sigma t \mu \in \theta e \rho-$
 v．41．xv．22．\＆34．Joh．i．42．Acts iv．36．In short，the thing is so certain that I have ven－ tured to edit $\lambda \in \gamma$ ónevov．
34． $\begin{gathered} \\ \xi \\ \text { os }-\mu е \mu ~ \\ \gamma \mu\end{gathered}$ ．］Mark xv．23．mentions a potion administered to Christ，which he calls é $\sigma \mu \nu \rho \nu \iota \sigma \mu$ évov oivov．And in order to remove the discrepancy，the best Commentators suppose that it was the same drink under different names， since $\delta$ Kos is used to denote wine；especially the poorer kinds，and such as we call made wines； and $\chi_{0} \lambda_{\dot{\eta}}$ ，though properly signifying wormwood， yet sometimes in the Sept．denotes any bitter infusion．Others are of opinion that the potion； mentioned by the two Evangelists were distinct mixtures；the vinegar mingled with gall being． they think，offered in derision；and the myrrhed wine，the medicated cup usually administered to criminals about to endure a painful death．The former interpretation，however，seems to be pre－ ferable，and it is confirmed by the antient gloss which has crept into many of the best MSS．and all the best of the antient Versions，oivov．
－चуа $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta \hat{\eta}-\kappa \lambda \bar{\eta} \rho o \nu$ ．］These words are found in comparatively few MSS．，（scarcely any of them antient），have no place in the antient Versions，and are not met with in several of the Fathers nor in the Edit．Princ．They have been cancelled by every Editor of note from Wets．to Scholz．
37．aitiay aüroû．］Namely，the Títhov，or
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incrpaфทiv Tîs altias, his crimination, the crime laid to his charge. This was engraven on a metal plate, in black characters on a white ground. The trifling discrepancy in the words of this inscription may very well have arisen from the language in which it was written.
38. dúo $\lambda$ noralal] i. e. 'highway robbers,' with which, and banditti of all sorts, Judea then swarmed; an evil, the prevalence of which is ascribed to excessive population, arising from frequency of divorce, misplaced lenity towards offenders, the impatience of the Jews under the Roman yoke, and the crafty policy of the governors in encouraging such offenders; all which circumstances appear from Josephus.
39. кцעоїvтes тàs кєф $\alpha \lambda \alpha$ s.] A mark of derision and contempt, common to all the nations of antiquity, (see Wets.), and here a fulfilment of prophecy. See Ps. xxi. 7.
40. $\dot{o}$ кara入 $\dot{c} \propto y$, , \&ce.] The $\delta$ refers to $\Sigma v$ understood; and ката入ívల and oiкоঠоц $\omega \nu$ are put populariter, in the sense ' who undertakes to destroy.' On which idiom see Glass Phil. Sacr.
41. кal трелßuтє́ $\rho \infty \nu$.$] Many of the best$ MSS. add kal $\Phi_{\text {apioatoov, which is adopted by }}$ Wets., Matth., Fritz., and Scholz.
42. $\bar{\alpha} \lambda$ גous- $\sigma \bar{\omega} \sigma a \imath$.] Beza, Beng., Pearce, and some others would take the words interrogatively; which makes them, they think, more cuttingly sarcastic. But this does violence to the contour of the passage, and destroys the antithesis, which, as Fritz. remarks, is strengthened by the Asyndeton. In further confirmation 1 have in Recens. Syn. adduced the following apt examples. Aristid. iii. 430. B. (of Palæ-

 Prom. V. 482. 5. какds $\delta$ ' latpos is $\tau 15$, els



- $\beta a \sigma \Delta \lambda e \dot{s}$, \&cc.] The Evangelists carefully distinguish the different taunts of the Jews, and the Romans: the former of whom adverted to Jesus's claim to be King of Israel, (i.e. Messiah):
the latter, to his assuming the title of King of the Jews, which, however, many of the Romans understood as equivalent to Messiah. The $\boldsymbol{q}^{\circ}$ is inserted by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz, on the authority of nearly all the best and the greater part of the MSS., several Versions and Fathers, and the Edit. Princ.

43. тézot $\theta$ ev $\dot{e} \pi i \tau d \nu \theta$.] The Commentators are at a loss to know what the railers here allude to; perhaps (they think) to his declaration at Matth. $\times \times v$. 53 . But that was probably delivered aside to his disciples. There is, I conceive, allusion to that fearlessmess with which Jesus yielded himself to the soldiers sent to apprehend him, and which might very well be thought to imply confidence in the Divine aid for deliverance. The railers, however, in this taunt, unwittingly fulfilled a remarkable prophecy of the Messiah, Ps. xxii. 8.
 manner of the Heb. pma, denotes to delight in.
44. oi $\lambda$ noт ${ }^{\text {Hil-aíróv. }}$.] Or rather one of them, as is stated in the more eract account of Luke. This trifing discrepancy may, however, be removed, not indeed by supposing an enallage, nor by introducing the figure Amplification, which cannot here apply; but by supposing that the Evangelist speaks generally. See Winer in his Gr. Gr. § 21. As to the solution propounded by Chrysost., Jerome, and other antient interpreters, that both at first joined in reviling, and then one, on seeing the meek and holy manner of Jesus, repented; it savours too much of a device for the nonce.
45. $\sigma \kappa \dot{o} \tau o s-\pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \nu \gamma \bar{\eta} \nu$.$] There are two$ points which here have occasioned no small perplexity to the Commentators; 1. the darkness here recorded; and 2. the distance to which it extended. On the former subject, they are not agreed as to the nature of the darkness, and its cause. The recent Commentators generally seek to account for it in the ordinary course of nature; the antient and most modern ones regard it as preternatural. That it could not be produced by a total eclipse of the sun, is certain ;

## 




for that can only happen at a change of the moon; whereas it was now full moon. Besides, a total eclipse never continues beyond a quarter of an hour. Some ascribe it to a mist arising from sulphureous vapours such as precede or accompany earthquakes. This, the naturalists $t \in l l$ us, may extend to a semi-diameter of ten miles from any spot. Those who adopt this view of the subject advert to the words of ver. 51. ธai म $\gamma \bar{\eta}$ íviiot $\eta$, \&cc. But can such a haze as that be all that is here meant? Taking all the circumstances into the account, both those occurrences may surely rather be regarded as preternatural, something in the manner of a portentous natural meteoric phanomenon described by Ebn Batuta, in his travels, who mentions a certain spot as being "enveloped by a dense black cloud so close to the earth that it might be almost touched with the hand." The darkness, which, it may be observed, is not said to have been total, (nor, indeed, from the circumstances which are recorded as accompanying it, could it be such ), was probably (for who shall dare to go beyond conjecture) produced (as Elsner supposes) by a preternatural accumulation of the densest clouds, enveloping the whole atmosphere, such as that mentioned at Exod. x.21-3., brought supermaturally, at the stretching forth of the hand of Moses, over the whole land of Egypt, except that portion occupied by the children of Israel, and which was meant to portend the calamities that should soon overwhelm the Jewish nation. See Mr. Scott on this passage, whose riew of the subject is, I find, nearly the same with my own.

But to turn to the second question; the ertent of this preternatural and most awful gloom. 1st, most of the antient interpreters regarded it as extending to the whole earth; while, 2dly, some of them, as Origen, and the most eminent modern ones, confine it to Judea; nay, those who hold the hypothesis of a thick haze such as precedes earthquakes, to the vicinity of Jerusalem. The second is, no doubt, the true solution. For, lst, there is nothing in the words of the original that compels us to suppose universality, and it is more natural to take the expression of Judica, the place of the transactions recorded. So in a kindred passage of Luke iv. 25. k'éverro $\lambda_{t} \mu d s$ $\dot{\dot{c}} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{i} \pi \bar{a} \sigma a \nu \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \gamma \bar{\eta} \nu$. The Fathers, indeed, and some modern Commentators (especially Grot.) allege, in proof of its being esteemed a prodigy, and of its universality, Phlegon, Thallus, and Dionys. the Areopagite. But they are not agreed on the nature of Phlegon's testimony; indeed nokhing which they ascribe to him has any direct bearing on this event. As to the passage adduced from Thallus ap. Africanum, who mentions a darkness over all the world, and an earthquake which overturned many houses in Judma and elsewhere, there is reason to think that Thallus lived before Christ; and as the antient Fathers quote him for other matters, but never for this, no weight can be attached to the pas-
sage in question. As to the story told of Dionys. the Areopagite, it is entitled to still less attention, since Dr. Lardner has proved that all the writings attributed to him are spurious. Besides, there was surely (if we may venture to pronounce on the inscrutable purposes of Almighty Providence) a peculiar propriety in the darkness being confined to Judea, as indicating the wrath of God on that country for the enormity there perpretating, and presenting an apt emblem of the spiritual darkness in which that benighted country was involved. Finally, by adopting this interpretation, and not too much exaggerating the intensity of the obscuration, we are enabled satisfactorily to account for the silence of the Pagan Historians, and even Josephus, without supposing in the latter a wilful suppression of truth. Indeed that writer has passed by other occurrences which we should as little think he would omit as this. As a further confirmation of the above, I have had occasion to refute a similar misinterpretation of $\gamma \bar{\eta}$ in Thucyd. i. 23.
46. 'H $\lambda i-\sigma \alpha \beta \alpha \chi \theta a \nu i$.] This is, with the exception of $\sigma a \beta$. (which is Syro Chaldaic), taken from Ps. xxii. 1. Mark writes 'E $\lambda \omega t$ and $\lambda a \mu \mu \bar{\alpha}$, making it all Syro-Chaldaic, which was the dialect then prevalent in Judæa, and, no doubt, used by our Lord. Of more consequence, however, is it to consider the exact import of the words, and the purpose for which they were pronounced. On both these points much has been written, but little determined. The words cannot be allowed to express (what some have ventured to ascribe to them) impatience, faintheartedness, and despair. Attempts have been made to effectually preclude this by giving them a very different sense to that which would naturally be ascribed to them. But this is too precarious a method to be entitled to much confidence. It is better to suppose, that by citing the verse, and applying it to himself, our Lord meant to turn the attention of his disciples to the whole Psalm, and to signify to them that he was now accomplishing what is there predicted of the Messiah. It has, however, been thought by some, that the words are too expressive of extreme mental suffering to admit of so limited an explanation. They would regard them as " the natural effusions of mental torture, scarce conscious of the complaints it uttered." But this seems not a sufficiently reverent view. The second is certainly preferable. At all events, no interpretation must be admitted which implies any expression of querulousness, or distrust in the favour and support of God. Moreover, on a subject so awfully mysterious as this, and that of the agony in the garden, it is better to abstain from all prying speculation, and learn, in the words of the Philosopher, owфpovcĩ \&̀ tî бoфí.
47. 'H $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ial ф woei.] These were not, as some imagine, Roman soldiers; for they could know nothing about Elias. The best Commentators
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are of opinion that they were Hellenistic Jews， who either mistook Christ＇s words，or rather intentionally and maliciously perverted them， in derision of his claim to be the Messiah，and with reference to a common opinion，that Elias would return to life at the coming of the Messiah， and prepare the way for his kingdom．
 quence of what Jesus had just before said（as recorded by Joh．xix．20．）si $\psi \omega$ ．Ka入 $\alpha \mu \varphi$ ． Some render reed；Campb．stick．But I prefer， with Markl．，＇a stalk；＇a not unfrequent，and perhape the primary sense of the word．Thus Matthew and John will be reconciled；for the $\dot{y} \sigma \sigma \omega^{\prime} \pi \omega$ of the latter is equivalent to $\kappa \alpha \lambda \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \mu$ $\dot{v} \sigma \sigma \sigma^{\pi} \dot{\sigma}$ ．The stalk of hyssop is，in the East， so long，that it might easily reach our Lord on the cross；especially since（as I have shown in Recens．Synop．）the cross was by no means so high as is commonly supposed．The repitels may be rendered，＇winding，or fastening it round．＇See Elsn．in loc．With the miñas otgous I have，in Recens．Synop．，compared
 медıтоя．
49．＂Aфes，toconev．］Sub．7va．This use of dфes and áфere is not pleonastic，（as some ima－ gine），but hortatory，like our come！
 man Physician，author of a learned Tract to prove the death of Christ real，and not，as some sceptics have pronounced，a mere syncope）and Kuin．take this to indicate a loud outcry from pain，as in the case of persons oppressed with an excessive congestion of blood about the heart， the precursor of suffocation．But that does not here apply；for this was not a mere outcry，or scream，but an articulate exclamation，（as is clear from Luke xviii．46．and Joh．xix．30．）namely，
 frequent in Scripture，especially as used of ex－ clamations in precatory addresses to God．See Rom．viii．15．Gal．iv．6．James v． 4.
－$\dot{\boldsymbol{\phi}} \bar{\eta} \kappa$ т $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ тvḕua．］Many antient and some modern Commentators suppose something preternatural in Christ＇s death，as being the effect of his volition．But there is nothing in the words of Scripture to countenance such an opinion ；though our Saviour＇s volition must be supposed to accompany his offering himself for the sins of the world．The term is no other than such as is frequently used，both in the Sept．and the Classical writers，of expiration，either with тveivan，or $\psi v \chi \dot{j} \nu$ ．From the comparative short－ ness of time during which our Lord survived his crucifixion，some Commentators have supposed an
eapecial interposition of the Deity．But it may very well be accounted for from natural causes， as is convincingly shewn by Gruner，in the above－ mentioned Tract de morteChristi vera，from which copious extracts may be seen in Recens．Synop．

51．кататéтабда тоù vaoù．］This expression designates the interior of the two veils which separated the Holy of Holies from the Sanctuary， and which is called by that name in the Sept．， Philo，and Josephus．On the form and mate－ rials of this veil，see the authors referred to in Recens．Synop．From a most interesting pas－ sage of Pausan．v．12，12．which I have there adduced，it appears，that exactly such a veil（of woollen，richly embroidered，and of purple）was used at the Temple of Diana at Ephesus，and that of Jupiter at Olympia．It reached from the roof to the ground，and admitted of being drawn up and down by ropes．

At els dúo there is the common ellipse of $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho \eta$ ． This rending of the veil（as I have shown in Recens．Synop．）must，like all the other occur－ rences of this awful scene，be regarded as pre－ ternatural．For though some recent Interpreters ascribe it to the earthquake just after recorded， it may be observed that no earthquake could rend a veil of 60 feet long，so exceedingly thick as， from its purpose，it must have been．Besides， the earthquake is plainly distinguished from the rending of the veil．It was，then，beyond doubt， supernatural ；and on the symbolical intent of it see Recens．Synop．
－кal $\eta \boldsymbol{\gamma} \hat{\eta} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \in i \sigma \theta \eta$ ．］This also must be re－ garded as preternatural；for though an earth－ quake is not of itself such，yet when we consider the circumstances which accompanied the one here described，we cannot but regard it as pro－ duced by the direct agency of the author of na－ ture，and therefore preternatural，and miracu－ lous．

Of this earthquake vestiges still remain in immense fissures，which attest the violence of the rending，and show the significancy and propriety of the words кal al тéтрat doxio－ өпба⿱亠䒑

52．кal тà $\mu \nu \eta \mu c i a ̀ d \nu \in \omega^{0} x^{\theta} \eta \sigma a \nu$ ．］An effect not unfrequently attributed to earthquakes in the antient writers．See Recens．Synop．Tcon кe－ $\kappa о \iota \mu \mu$ н́vciv（deceased）is not，as some imagine， an Hebraism，for the idiom occurs also in the Classical writers．
 narrative there are three points deserving of at－ tention．1．Who were the of кєкоıиŋцévol． 2. What was the purpose of their being raised from the dead．3．What was the time at which it took
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place. They were holy persons, whether Jews, (as old Simeon), or such as had lately died in the faith of Christ. They must have been persons not long dead, or they would not have been recognised by their contemporaries. The purpase is, with most probability, supposed to have been, to show that the power of the grave was destroyed by life and immortality being brought to light by the Gospel, and thus an emblem given of the general resurrection. As to the time, that will depend on whether the words meta tiv ézuepaıv aúтoû be taken with the proceding, or the following ones; on which Interprefers, antient and modern, are divided in opinion. The former method seems the best founded. We need not, however, suppose, with some who adopt this view, that the resurrection in question was gradual, begun at the rending open of the graven, and accomplished after the resurrection of Christ. That would be too hypothetical ; nor is it required by the declaration of the Apostle at Col. i. 18. and 1 Cor. xv. 20. that "Jesus was the first born from the dead, and the first fruits of those that slept." It is better to suppose, (with some antient and a few modern Commentators), that the words are inserted somewhat out of place, and perhaps belong to by ip $\theta_{\eta}$. As to the hypothesis of the sceptical school in Germany, that the verses are spurious, it may be answered that, if an interpolation, it must be a very early one, since the words are found in all the MSS. and Versions, and are so alluded to by the early Fathers as to show their existence in their time; and interpolation at an earlier period was next to impossible.
54. d $\lambda_{\eta} 0$ wis-oiros.] I have proved at large in Recens. Synop. that $\theta$ eoū vide cannot mean, as Grot., Mark., Campo., Rosenm., and Kuin. maintain, 'an innocent and just man,' or a son of a God, (i.e. a demi-god) ; but the Son of God, the Messiah. The soldiers must have known Jesus's pretensions to be such; and the import of the phrase must have been familiar to them. And seeing the awful and preternatural circumstances which accompanied his death, it was natural that they should exclaim, some of them,

This was truly an innocent and just person! and others, This was truly the personage he affirmed himself to be-the Son of God!
57. ठ广ias de yevoućvns.] Sub. wo pas.

- aid 'Ap.] scil. ©̂̀v, who was of Arimathsea. This sense of $d \pi \delta$, for which $d x$ is sometimes used, corresponds to the Latin ex, the Welsh $a p$, and our of. The riches and honourable station of Joseph are mentioned, to show the fulfilment of Is. liii. 9. The circumstance was in all respects most unlikely to happen. The best Commentators are agreed that he was one of the Sanhedrin ; for ßou入eurris may be taken mmproprie for ${ }^{3} \rho \mathrm{X} \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$.
 transitive sense examples are adduced by Wets. and Kypke from Plutarch and Jamblichus. The transitive sense (though rare in the Classical writers) occurs in the New Testament.

58. ท่าगiбaтo Td $\sigma \bar{\omega} \mu \alpha$.] Though the bodies of crucified persons were not buried by Roman magistrates, yet they were generally given, on application, to their friends for burial. This was more especially done in Judea, because the custom of the country, (founded on the Scriptural command, Deut. xxi. 23.), required the bodies to be buried before sun-set ; and more especially in the present case, on account of the approaching festival.
59. ¿עeтú $\left.\lambda_{\iota} \xi \in \nu-\sigma \iota \nu \delta \delta v_{1}.\right]$ Similar language is found in Herodot. ii. 86: in his account of embalming. The $\sigma \iota \nu \delta \omega^{2} v$ was a web, or wrapper of fine linen, which was used for the same purposes as our sheets, (see Thucyd. ii. 49. and my Note there), and also employed to roll around a corpse previously to interment or embalming, being secured by linen bandages. The word is derived by some from Sidon, where this linen was made. But it was chiefly manufactured in Egypt, and is therefore best derived from a similar word in the Coptic. Though I suspect that it there had its name (as in the case of our nankeen and muslin, so denominated from Nankin and Masulipatam) from the article being originally brought from Sind, (i.e. Hindoostan), by that trade which from a period anterior to
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all history had subsisted between Egypt and the East.
 cumstances are mentioned, to show the honour rendered by Joseph, (thus Dio says Augustus buried Agrippa in his own tomb), and to preclude any cavil, as if the corpse had been resuscitated by touching the bones of some prophet; see 2 Kings xiii. 20.; and for the general evidence for the reality of the resurrection, see Sherlock's Trial of the witnesses, and other writers, or the substance in Horne's Introd. Vol. 1. 262.

- $\tau \bar{\eta} \pi \dot{j} \tau \rho a$.] The Article here is very significant, and indicates the rockiness of the country, on which we have the testimony of Strabo and Josephus, confirmed by modern travellers. ח${ }_{\rho o \sigma}-$ cu $\lambda \mathcal{I} \sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The Commentators remark, that it was an Oriental custom thus to guard the entrances of caves, and also of subterraneous sepulchres. This was, however, not confined to the East, but extended to the West, as appears from the Classical passages adduced by Grot. and by myself in Recens. Synop.; from whence it appears that in the early ages stones were generally used in the place of doors. (Nay the Greek $\theta \dot{v} \rho a$, as appears from Mom. Od. xiii. 370., only signifies orifice through which there is a passage.) The stone panelled doors which close many of the Egyptian monuments, are clearly a device midway between the block of stone of the primitive times, and the wooden door of after ages.
 the day preceding any sabbath or festival, as being that on which the preparation for its celebration was to be made. Evurix $\theta$ nav $\pi \rho d s$ convenerunt ad Pilatum. There is a significatio prægnans for, they went to and assembled at, i. e. they went in a body to.

63. $\pi \lambda d \nu$ os.] This word, like the Latin planus, signified properly a vagabond, and, from the adjunct, a cheat, impostor, \&c. Meta Tpeīs $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\operatorname{c}} \mathrm{pas}$, i. e. within three days, on the third day. See Note on Matt. xvi. 21. That the Jews (says

Dr. Owen) so understood it, is plain from the next verse. "A most amazing instance of God's, providence (says Markland) to make Jesus' greatest enemies bear witness that before his death he had foretold his resurrection within three days." To which of the prophecies (whethe that at Matt. xii. 40., or at Matt. xxvi. 61.) they alluded, is not clear. Certain it is, however, that our Lord's declaration was publicly known.
 verbial saying, importing that it would be worse if the whole people should acknowledge him as Messiah, and thus rise up into rebellion. Nukcds after aùroü is wanting in most of the best MSS., Versions, and some Fathers, and is cancelled by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz. Yet it is defended by xxviii. 13 .
65. Exंeve коиaтcodiav.] The Commentators are not agreed whether exert should be taken in the Indicative, or the Imperative; since either method is admissible. But as no example has been adduced of such a use of exerts as to take, though found in the corresponding term of moder languages ; and especially as the sense thus yielded is not so suitable to what follows, the former (which is confirmed by some antient and the best modern Commentators), seems preferable. Render, ' ye have a guard,' namely, that stationed in the Castle of Antonia, and which was meant to quell any tumult in the city. 'Os oldare. The sense of this is controverted; but the best rendering seems to be that of Grot., Schleus, and others, 'quantum potestis.' In truth, there is an ellipsis of d $\sigma \phi$ р $\lambda$ eq $\sigma a \tau a$, to be supplied from $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi a \lambda i \sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon$. The literal sense is, ' as safely as ye know how,' i.e. as ye are able.
66. $\sigma \phi \rho a \gamma i \sigma a \nu \tau e s$.] A mode of security in use from the earliest times, as we find from Daniel vi. 17., when also it supplied the place of locks. See the Classical citations adduced by Wets. and in Recens. Synop. In the present case. the sealing (no doubt with Pilate's seal) is.
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supposed to have been affixed to the two ends of a cord or band brought round the stone．Me ra iss коuनтendias may either，by such a transposi－ Lion as that supra ver．53．，be referred（with Raphael，Kypke，and Kain．）to $\dot{\eta} \sigma \phi a \lambda$（ $\sigma a \nu r o$ Tory Tádoy；or rather the words may be taken （with Fritz．）as a brachylogia for $\mu \in \tau \dot{a}$ tout т poo日eìvat Tiv коvaтmodiav，＇together with（a setting of）the guard，＇i．e．at this same time that they set the guard．

XXVIII．1．d४̀̀ $\delta \dot{\text { ex }}$ $\sigma \alpha \beta \beta$ ．］i．e．as Krebs， Wahl，and Titty．explain，＇after the sabbath，＇ （as Mark more clearly expresses it）Jıayevo $\mu$ évou той бaßßácov．Of this signification the above Commentators adduce examples from Philostr．， Plat．，KAlian，and Xenophon．

 occurs in Herodot．iii．86．\＆ix．44．The word is sid by Casaub．to be used properly of the first appearing of the heavenly bodies．It may be paralleled by our verb to dawn，whence dawn－ ing and dawn．The phrase here signifies the first streak of the dawn．

2．cal Loos $\sigma e c \sigma \mu \delta s$ \＆cc．］I have in Recess． Synop．shown that the interpretation of $\sigma \in \epsilon \sigma \mu \partial s$ propounded by some Interpreters（namely，a tesupert or whirlwind）cannot be admitted．Still less that of＇trembling＇or＇fear．＇Not merely absurd，but irreverent，is the interpretation of arye入os by the Sceptical School of Theologians in Germany，by which it is made to mean，not a person，but a thing，i．e．lightning or flames， which often accompany earthquakes．
3． 1 ¿éa］form，figure，or appearance；a sig－ nification frequent in the best Classical writers． curdy novel xtóv．A simile of frequent occur－ rence in writers of every nation．＂Whiteness （says Grot．）has ever been a symbol of purity and sanctity．＂See Dan．vii．9．Apoc．iii． 4. xviii．4．vi．11．vii．9．\＆13．Hence among all the nations of antiquity，it was customary for
those who were celebrating divine worship，to be clothed in white．But to this whiteness of garment there was，in these angels，superadded an undefinable and peculiar splendour，like what is attributed to Christ in the transfiguration．
 doтрaxтóvoaıs，a sign of celestial glory，such as Herod presumptuously affected；as we find from Acts xii． 22.
4．died tout $\phi$ óßou］＇Ad here denotes the origin and author of the fear；an idiom common to both Greek and Latin．＇Eyévouto wifely vex－ poi．An hyperbolical phrase common to all ages and all languages．
6．тózov］The word here denotes the cavity， or cell，hollowed out in the vault，and in which was deposited the corpse．
8．$\mu \nu \eta \mu$ еіou ${ }^{\text {The }} \mu \nu \eta \mu e i o \nu$ ，or monumentum， amongst the Greeks and Romans，and perhaps the Jews，consisted of the cave， and $ה צ \pi$, rd $\dot{\pi} \pi a, \theta \rho o \nu$ ，a small inclosure in the open air before it．This whole $\mu \nu \eta \mu$ eĩo was also situated in a larger space of ground，without the inclosure，called by the Romans tutela mona－ menti；here the cultivated garden．
－$\mu$ evà фóßov cal xapãs．］The phraseology （with which Wets．compares several passages from the Classical writers）happily expresses the mingled sensations of fear（or rather awe）at the appearance of the angel，and joy at the good news he announced．
9．wis $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\text { en }} \boldsymbol{\text { en }}$ $\mathbf{X a i \rho e \tau e . ~ T h i s ~ i s ~ w r o n g l y ~ r e n d e r e d ~ b y ~ C a m p b . ~}$ ＇rejoice．＇It is a common form of salutation． So the Syriac renders，＇Pax vobis！＇Our Hail！ best represents the sense，since hail，in the lan－ guage of our ancestors，denoted health，pros－ perity，and good of every kind．＇EкpdтクJav тódas，i．e．in the manner of suppliants，who used to prostrate themselves and embrace the feet of those from whom they sought protection．Brag．， Lights．，and Rosenm．take it to mean＂kissed his
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C. I. Since the whole of St. Mark's Gospel (with the exception of some 25 verses, and but a few short, though important, additional clauses) is, as far as regards matter, contained in the Gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, and the phraseology of that matter is nearly the same, it has been judged unnecessary to give any regular comment on those common portions, when no variation of phraseology is presented, nay even to give constant references, which the brevity of annotation required in this work forbids. The reader is therefore requested, in cases where no comment is found, to turn to the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke.
 Gospel we encounter a difficulty at the very threshold; for the Commentators are by no means agreed on the construction of the first four verses, and consequently their sense. Some, as Euthym., Theophyl., Grot., and others, place a comma after $\theta$ eovi, and lay down the sense as follows : 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus the Messiah thus happened, as it was written in the prophet.' But that sense would require (as Fritz. remarks) the Article at $d \rho \chi^{r}$, a copula
 a verb to be supplied. Far preferable is the method adopted by those who (as Le Clerc, Wets., Beza, Campb., Rosenm. and Kuin.) regard ver. 1. as a separate sentence, presenting a kind of title to the work. "It was not unusual (says Campb.) with authors to prefix a short sentence, to serve both as a title to the book, and to signify that the beginning immediately followed. So Hosea i. 1." In this view they quote the commencing sentence of the History of Herodotus, to which I have, in Recens. Syoop., added the beginnings of Thucyd., Procep., Ocell. Luc. Timaus, and other writers. Thus the cos (sicut) refers to ver. 4, as the completion of the prophecies mentioned. The above may probably be the best way of taking the passage; but it is not necessary (with Kuin. and others) to supply $\ddot{0} \boldsymbol{\delta} \eta$ é $\sigma \tau \iota$ at $d \rho \times \eta{ }^{\eta}$, since (as Fritz. has observed) the pronoun is never required in a title, because the very place of the title prefixed to a book shows it to belong to the very book to which it is prefixed. For the same reason the

Article is not wanted at d $\rho$ Xr. Still there is something weak in the prools supporting this mode of interpretation; for not one of the passages cited from the beginnings of the Historians above mentioned and Hosea are quite to the purpose. And as to the custom, (to which Campb. appeals), in the middle ages, of scribes placing incipit at the beginning, and explicit at the end of their transcripts, it is nothing to the purpose. I would therefore adopt the mode of taking the passage proposed by Erasm., Zeger, Mark., and Fritz.; namely, to place a comma after $\Theta e o v ̃$, and lay down the following as the construction: 'ApXì тoü eivarye入iov In


 pretation there is nothing to object on the score of grammutical propriety; and though this suspension of the sense is somewhat awkward, yet the style of the Evangelist, it may be remarked, is occasionally rough and harsh. The sense thus arising is excellent; for that the preaching of John was the commencement of the Gospel Dispensation, is plain from Luke xvi. 16.
2. év 'Haala $\tau$. x $\rho$.] Such is read in several of the best MSS., followed by all the most important of the antient Versions, and is preferred by some of the most eminent Commentators, and justly edited by Griesb., Knapp. Tittm., and Scholz. ; the superior weight of MS. authority for the common reading \&y rois xpoopitals being overbalanced by critical reasons. Yet even thus the passage may be considered as not quite emended. There is surely as great reason to think 'Hoata to have come from the margin, as there is to suppose rois $\pi \rho 0 \phi \dot{1}$ acas to have arisen ex emendatione. It is not found in some antient MSS. and the Syr., Pers., Goth., Vulg., and Ital. vulgate Versions; and $\dot{\nu} \nu \tau \bar{\varphi} \pi \rho \circ \phi \dot{\gamma} \tau$ is with reason edited by Fritz., for, as Mill says, such was the original reading, whence the other two arose, from those who endeavoured, in two different ways, to supply what seemed a deficiency.
The first passage is taken from Malachi, the second from Is. xl. 3. The neglect of the formula citations before the second passage is
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agreeably to a not infrequent custom of Jewish writers，on which Fritz．refers to Surenh．$\beta \iota \beta \lambda$ ． carald．p． 45.
－d $\mu$ zrpoofév gov］These words are omitted in a few antient MSS．，some Versions，and Origen and Victor，and are cancelled by Griesb．，Fritz．， and Scholx．，who suppose them to have been introduced from Math．xi．10．and Luke vii．27． Fritz．，indeed，imagines no reason why they should have been cancelled，if they had been written by the Evangelist．But as the number of MSS．in which they are omitted is very small， we may suppose the clause to have been omitted proper hopscoteleuton．

5．wal old．］The cal is not a mere copula，but is well rendered by Fritz．＇and（what is re－ markable）＇．Griesbach＇s alteration er $\xi$ еторси́ето is quite unnecessary，and devoid of proper au－ thority ；and his change of the place of $\pi d \dot{d} \nu$ es， and putting it after Iepog．，（in which he is followed by Knapp and Titty．），is even less defensible．It is only found in six MSS．and some Versions，which，however，are no great authority on points which respect the order of words．And even if there were far more autho－ city，the reading in question would be（as Fritz． has shown）inadmissible，from its yielding a sense not at all satisfactory．The meaning is either， that very many（of them）were baptized，\＆c．，or， that all who made ample confession of their sins were baptized．

6．iv dudedunévos］The $\eta \nu$ must be repeated at doticon．The sense is，＇He used to be clothed －and to eat，＇\＆cc．I have，with Fritz．，adopted the Article at＇Icodyvir，which is found in many MSS．，（some of them antient），the Edit．Princ．， and all the early Editions up to Stephens＇se－ cond，as also in Theophyl．And it is required by the proprietas linguse．

7．oúx elul ixayds］Literally，ineptus sum， I am unfit．Kíqas．This expresses the posture
in which the action was done．And indeed as the sandals were fastened to the foot by very complicated straps，they could not be loosed without some trouble．This was therefore esteem－ ed a menial office，and was usually committed to slaves．Matthew iii．11．has $\tau i$ imzodinata Baбтíซal．But it is probable that the Baptist used both expressions．

9．каl ¿үенето－ $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta e \nu$ ］A construction fra－ quant in the Gospels，and derived from the Hebrew．See Genes．xiv．1．\＆2．Most Com－ mentators supply ${ }^{\circ} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ ．But it is justly observed by Fritz．，that the construction may be con－ sidered as bimembris，wherein the first member is explained by the second，which is added per asyndeton，and may，in translation，be introduced by nempe．The more usual form of the idiom is when the dүeंvero is followed by a cal．＇Ep exкeivats ijeípats．Namely，when John was preaching in the desert the baptism of repent－ once．Tins 「a入ı入aias is added to Nazareth，to determine its situation，as it was an obscure place．Bis is not here for $\dot{d} y$ ，as most Commen－ taters imagine，who adduce examples which are quite inapposite．The sense of $\dot{d} \beta a \pi \tau$ ．els is， ＇was dipped＇or plunged into．Or we may sup－ pose，that as in the phrase גoúeofat els $\beta$ a入aveion there is a signification pragnans，for＇to be washed （by being immerged）into a bath ；＇so the sense here may be，＇He underwent the rite of baptism （by being plunged）into the water．＇

10．eidéces］Lights．and Wets．remark on the very frequent，and sometimes unnecessary use of cioécos and ci $\theta \dot{\partial}$ s by Mark．But，as Fritz．ob－ serves，they are perhaps never used unnecessarily， though they may seem to be so，by being con－ strued with the wrong word；for，they are often， as here，put per hyperbaton．For here cidécos must be construed with eide，which must be referred to Jesus，（with Erasm．，Rosenm．，Kuin．， and Fritz．），not John，with others．$\Sigma_{X}$ ！Yopévous．
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Elsn. and Wets. adduce numerous passages in which mention is made of the heavens being cleaved with lightning. But it is truly remarked by Fritz. that they are all dissimilar; for (to use his own words) "hic coelum dehiscit, ut divinus spiritus, relicto domicilio, ad Jesum desuper
 oípavoi.

- $\dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} e l]$ Many MSS., and indeed most of the antient ones, have cis, which is edited by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz., who think the common reading was derived from the other Gospels. There is not, however, sufficient authority to warrant any change. The expression does not define the form of appearance, (though it was, as we learn from Luke iii. 22., in a bodily form), but the manner of its descent, namely, like the rapid gliding of a dove.

11. $\left.\frac{\epsilon}{L} \nu \bar{\varphi}\right]$ Several antient MSS., and almost all the Versions have $\epsilon \nu \sigma o l$, which is confirmed by Luke iii. 22., and is edited by Griesb. and Fritz. This may be the true reading; but there is not sufficient authority to warrant any change, especially as in MSS. the two words are very much alike.
12. éк $\left.{ }^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \lambda^{\prime} \lambda_{e c}\right]$ This is not well rendered by Grot. and others, 'discedere jubet,' or 'emisit sine vi.' But the word (which, as I observed in Recens. Synop., is very appropriate to the influence of the Divine Spirit), must here be taken of the strong and efficacious (though not overpowering ) influence of the Holy Ghost.
13. ${ }^{j \nu}$ ] 'abode.' Mespaそоцеvos being [meanwhile] tempted. The words кal $\dot{\eta} \nu \mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ Onpico describe the scene of the temptation, which was one of the roughest and wildest parts of the desert. So Virg. En. iii. 646. (cited by Wets.) Quam vitam in silvis inter deserta ferarum lustra domosque traho. See Euthym.
 is said $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \overline{0} \sigma \theta a u$, partly when it is gone, partly when any definite period approaches. So Joh. vii. 8. Luke xxi. 24. Wets. compares Joseph.



Acts vii. 23, 30. "The time here spoken of (says Campb.) is that which, according to the predictions of the Prophets, was to intervene between their days, or between any period assigned by them, and the appearance of the Messiah. This had been revealed to Daniel, as consisting of what, in prophetic language, is denominated seventy weeks, that is, (every week being seren years), 490 years; reckoning from the order issued to rebuild the Temple at Jerusalem. However much the Jews misunderstood many of the other prophecies relating to the reign of this extraordinary personage, what concerned both the time and the place of his first appearance seems to have been pretty well apprebended by the bulk of the nation. From the New Testament, as well as from the other accounts of that period still extant, it is evident that an expecta. tion of this great deliverer was then general among them. It is a point of some consequence to the cause of Christianity, that both the time and the place of our Lond's birth coincided with the interpretations then commonly given of the prophecies by the Jews themselves, his contemporaries."

- $\mu$ eravoeite] Meravoeì denotes 1. to change one's opinion; 2 . to so change it as to wish we had acted otherwise; 3. from the adjunct, to be reformed in mind and conduct.
 made by some Coimmentators between tıoreúus
 ed. The only difference is, that the former is the Hellenistic, the latter the Classical form. The sense here is, 'place your confidence, for salvation, in the Gospel;' or rather, 'be brought to a true faith in the Gospel.'

16. $\beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda$ ioveas] Most of the antient MSS. have $\alpha \mu \phi 1 \beta a \lambda \lambda \alpha_{v}{ }^{2} a s$, which is edited by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz. But as no example has been adduced of the compound in this phrase, (where the $\alpha \mu \phi t$ is rendered by Fritz. huc illuc), there seems no sufficient authority to alter the common reading; and probably the $\alpha \mu \phi$ c may have originated in a mere error of the scribes.




















17. катартi\}ovras] Karapri¢̧ev signifies 1. to restore to its former state what has been isarranged or broken; 2. to repair; and it is used of ships, nets, walls, \&c. \&ec. Kail aùroús. This expression is (as Fritz. thinks) used, because James and John were employed on the same kind of business, namely, what was connected with fishing.
18. Toil $\sigma \alpha \beta^{\beta} \beta_{a \sigma w] ~ T h i s ~ c l a u s e, ~ a s ~ s o m e ~}^{\text {a }}$ imagine, alludes to our Lord's custom of attending the Synagogue every sabbath day. But it should rather, with some antient and most moden Commentators, be taken of one particular Sabbath, the next Sabbath, as is plain from the coles and what follows. On this use of ta ó́ß para (which Fritz. thinks originated from the Chaldee singular form in emphasis xnty), sec Sehleus. Lex.
19. Iv rvév.иart dка0а́pтب!] Some take the in for ode ; for which there is no sufficient authority. Others, more properly, render, ' in the power of an unclean spirit, or, 'occupied by an unclean spirit,' 'having an unclean spirit,' as Luke says. The man must have had lucid intervals, or he would not have been admitted to the Synagogue. His disorder seems to have been epilepsy brought on by Demoniacal agency.
20. ea] An interjection derived from the lmperative of éàv, signifying let us alone! It expresses indignation of extreme surprise. Tl $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \bar{i} \nu$ rat col, scan. rowdy, which is sometimes supprised in the Classical writers.
 are not agreed whether this clause should be taken interrogatively, or declaratively. The recent Editors mostly prefer the latter mode. But there is more point and spirit, and perhaps
more propriety, in the former. By drodéoat is not meant (as most of the Commentators imasine) Baoavioal, the term used by Matthew; but rather, as Euthym. explains, to destroy our power by expelling us from earth; as $\beta a \sigma-$ avioas expresses the final end of them, namely, being consigned to Hell torments. By $\dot{\eta} \mu \alpha \hat{s}$ is evidently meant his colleagues. 'O "̈ytos roup $\theta \in o \overline{0}$ signifies, by the force of the Article, the Messiah, as being кат' égoxウ̀v such. See Camp. Diss. vi. P. iv.
21. бтapá kay] $\Sigma \pi a \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma e \iota \nu ~ p r o p e r l y ~ s i g n i-~$ fies to tear, lacerate ; but here and in Luke ix. 39. it signifies to bring on violent convulsions and spasms, such as accompany epilepsy, and which are sometimes called ora pay 10 , though usually $\sigma \pi a \sigma \mu$ oi by the Greek Medical writers. See Wets.
22. $\pi \rho d s$ aútoús] Fritz. and Scholz. edit cautious, from many MSS., indeed most of the antient ones. It is, however, of more consequince to consider the sense, which is by almost all Commentators considered as equivalent to $\pi \rho \delta s \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \eta \lambda$ ours ; and they render inter 8 . Fritz., however, contends that it signifies 'apud animum sum.' But the $\sigma v \zeta \eta \tau<i ̄ v$ requires the common interpretation, which is also confirmed by the antient Versions.

- Ti dort-aíry] Chrys. and Euthym., of the antients; and Maldon. and Fritz., of the moderns, have alone seen the true scope of this clause, which expresses not so much interrogtion as admonition. The whole may be rendered thus: 'What is this? of what sort is this new (i.e. extraordinary) mode of teaching; for (the teacher) gives his order authoritatively to the unclean spirits, and they obey him!' Of this
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Elan. and Wets. adduce numerous passages in which mention is made of the heavens being cleaved with lightning. But it is truly remarked by Fritz, that they are all dissimilar; for (to use his own words) "hic colum dehisceit, ut divinus spiritus, relict domicilio, ad Jesun desuper posit allabi." So Math. iii. 16. divert $\chi^{\theta \eta}{ }^{\text {I }}$ av oi oѝpavoí.
 antient ones, have $\omega$ 's, which is edited by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz., who think the common reading was derived from the other Gospels. There is not, however, sufficient authority to warrant any change. The expression does not define the form of appearance, (though it was, as we learn from Luke iii. 22., in a bodily form), but the manner of its descent, namely, like the rapid gliding of a dove.
11. $\left.\dot{e j v}{ }^{*}\right]$ Several ancient MSS, and almost all the Versions have év oil, which is confirmed by Luke iii. 22., and is edited by Griesb. and Fritz. This may be the true reading; but there is not sufficient authority to warrant any change, especially as in MSS. the two words are very much alike.
12. ér $\kappa \dot{\beta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ ] This is not well rendered by Grot. and others, 'discedere jubet,' or 'emisit sine vi.' But the word (which, as I observed in Recess. Synop., is very appropriate to the influence of the Divine Spirit), must here be taken of the strong and efficacious (though not overpowering ) influence of the Holy Ghost.
13. $\bar{\eta} p$ ] 'abode.' II eiprobopevos being [mean-
 Onpitw describe the scene of the temptation which was one of the roughest and wildest part is of the desert. So Virgo. En, iii. 646. (cited lis Wets.) Quam vitam in silvis inter deserta fore rum lustra domosque traho. See Euthym.
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such reading has ever been rejected even without being weighed in the balance and found (as 1 conceive) wanting.
2. é $\mu \beta \rho \iota \mu \eta \sigma \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu o s]$ 'having given him a strict
 d $\pi \in \lambda v \sigma \epsilon$, dispatched him quickly, as Euthym. explains.
II. 1. $\left.\delta \imath^{\prime} \eta j \mu \epsilon \rho \bar{\omega} \nu\right]$ Euthym. and Theophyl.
 'after some days had intervened.' This sense of ôii (mostly in compusition) occurs hoth in the N.T. and the Sept., and also in the best Clas-
 $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota v$ is the position supported by many MNS., most indeed of the antient ones, with the Byr. and other antient Versions, and some Fuhera: and it is found in the Edit. Princ. It in righty edited by Matth., Fritz., and Scholz.

- Els oTkóv ] domi, at home, namely, in the house in which he sojourned. This is regarlail as an example of the use of elg for $\bar{d} p_{\text {。 }}$. Bnt there seems to be rather a blending of two formin of expression, namely, 'He has gone to his henem and is in it.'
 for $\tau \delta \pi \rho o$ Oupon, the vestibule. Thu mange of the passage is, 'So that there war no longan place for them in the vestibule (much les thas houte
 $\xi v \nu e \lambda \theta \dot{\partial} \nu \tau a s$ aùzous $\eta$ ísó̀ıv.

 Euthym. supplies; the doetrime of the Geipl
 four persons,' namely, bearing a litten, "ppes unto, or rather towards.











 terpretation of this passage there are some difficulties, which have appeared to many Commentators so formidable that they have endeavoured to remove them by resorting to various methods, almost all of them (as I have shown in Recens. Synop., and Fritz. in loc.) at variance with the meaning of the words $\alpha \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau \in \dot{\gamma} \alpha \sigma a \nu, \sigma \tau \in ́ \gamma \eta \nu$,
 Whitby, Kuin., and Winer is least liable to objection. This supposes that the bearers brought the paralytic to the flat roof of the house by the stairs on the outside, or along the top from an adjoining house; and then forced open the trap
 But that forcing open the trap-door has nothing to countenance it; for, as Fritz. remarks, the
 that the bearens tore off the tiles in the very place under which they knew Jesus to be. The only view which the words will permit us to take is that which I brought forward in Recens. Synop.; namely, to suppose that, not able to approach Jesus in the room where he was, (whether on the ground-floor, or, as is more probable, an upper room), they ascended to the flat roof by the outer stairs, and uncovered the roofing, (whether tiles or thatching), and dug through the lathe and plaster, about the place where they understood Jesus to be, and let the couch down through the orifice. No other method could have effectually secured the object, namely, of bringing the litter to Jesus, without having to pass through the crowd. The passage through the trap-door would have been far too narrow, and not have admitted of being widened without doing more damage to the house than the method just adverted to.

Instead of éoopúgavres, I have, in Recens. Synop., shown that Classical use would require doopúgavtes, as in many passages there cited, followed by words signifying rooting. But ekop. has here a significatio pregnans, i.e. digging through and scooping out; which implies pulling out. Thus all is plain.

- $\left.x^{\wedge \lambda \omega \sigma}\right]^{\prime}$ 'Yet, or lower, down.' So Acts
 17. 2 Cor. xi.33. Jerem. xxxviii. 6. The word does not occur in the best Classical writers.

6. ool.] Griesb., Tittm., and Fritz. edit rov̂, omitting the $\sigma o \overline{\text { ol }}$ following, from some MSS., confimmed, as they think, by ver. 9. But those MSS. are too few to have much weight; and
ver. 9. can have none; for supposing oou there to be the true reading, yet what is so likely as when a formula such as dфécovtat oot al a $\mu a \rho-$ riat oov is not directly employed, but only recounted as having been used, that it should be shortened.
7. oüTco] This is omitted in some MSSa, and is cancelled by Fritz. But it must be retained, as being very significant. The sense is, 'Why, or how, does that man (dare to) so speak blasphemies,' i. e. to speak such (great) blasphemy.
 Өcds, in the sense, 'but one-that is God.' And they adduce as examples Matth. xix. 17. and Mark x. 18. But in those passages the common punctuation and interpretation adopted in this by which eIs is taken in the sense solus, only (answering to the use of the Heb. 7TM in Exod. xxxiii. 5. Judg. xxi.) is even more required than in the present; and in all of these it is confirmed by the antient Versions. Besides, it is required by the parallel passage of Luke.

- т甲̄ тעєúpatt aútoū] Some antient and early modern Commentators take this to designate "his Divine nature", which consequently imported omniscience. Others interpret it, 'by the Spirit' i. e. the Holy Spirit, which, as man, our Lord had received. But of these two interpretations the former wants proof; and the latter is negatived by the aüroû added. Preferable is a third, supported by most recent Commentators, as Rosenm., Kuin., and Fritz., 'in his mind,' i. e. in himself. This, however, is a curtailment of the sense, which seems to be, "by his own spirit,' or, 'by his spirit.' Thus spirit will be used emphatically for the spirit of wisdom, or understanding, excellent spirit, and other such phrases, which occur in Scripture. Of counse, this will have reference to the human nature only of our Lord. "The intention (says Campbell) of the sacred writer was to signify, that our Lord, in this case, did not, as others, derive his knowledge from the ordinary and outward methods of discovery which are open to all men, but from peculiar powers he poseessed independently of every thing external."

The word d $\pi$ t $\gamma$ vous is better rendered 'heving perceived,' (as in our common Version), or 'discovered,' than 'knowing,' as in most recent Versions. So Eschyl. Agam. 1588. driçvovs epyov. and often in Thucyd. and other writers. So Acts ix. 30 . \&̇xiyvóvres.

- aúтoi] This word is found in a great ma.






 тò̀ Өєòv 入é














jority of the MSS., including many of the best, in several Versions, and Theophyl., also in the Edit. Prince. It has been admitted by Wets., Math., Griesb., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz.

9. nov] This reading is supported by a great majority of the beet MSS., some Versions, Fathers, and the Edit. Princ.; and is admitted by Meth., Griesb., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz.

- eyetpe] So Math., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz edit. with several of the best MSS. and some early Editions, for eq $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ t $\rho a t$, which is a very irregular form, and (as Fritz. has shown) cannot well be defended. Yet it may have been a popular form, like some others used by Mark; and the reading is in all the passages doubtful. The cal following is omitted in several of the best MSS. and some Versions, and is cancelled by almost all Editors from Griesb. to Scholz; but on scarcely sufficient evidence.

10,11. Protasi \%va dè elòñre-ánaptias compellantur jureconsulti, apodosi autem, quemad-
 manifestat scriptor, ad arthriticum oration con-
 hic, quem videtis, homini condonandorum flagitiorum potestatem in terra esse commissam (que sequantur dicit arthritics) tibia dico, age' \&cc. (Fritz.)
 of the common one $d \phi$. d al $\tau \hat{j} s \gamma^{\hat{n} s}$ is found in a very great number of MSS. and Versions, and
is adopted by Math., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz.
12. 'ivavitiov] coral. This is not a mere Hebraism, but is a use found in the Classical wiitors. At out cos Heupel would supply $\tau i$ and $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\mu}$ vol. Fritz. maintains that it signifies hos mode, equivalent to ut hic res est.
 $\mu$ evou. The cal just after signifies alto, too.

- $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta} a \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho-a i \tau \bar{\varphi}]$ These words have been variously rendered, and indeed admit of more than one sense. Most Commentators, (after Grot.), take the cal for the relative oi, and remder, ' 'for there were many, who had followed Levi and had sat down to table with him.' But this involves a needless repetition, and it should rather seem that the aires is to be referred to Jesus, and the sense what Fritz, assigns,' 'for there were many present (in Levi's house), and they had followed Jesus into the house.'

16. $\tau i \ddot{\partial} \tau t]$ The sense of this idiom (which occurs both in the Scriptural and Classical wiitens) is, ' What is (the cause) that,' 'How is it that.' In the Classical writers a particle is generally interposed.
17. els peedduocav] These words are wanting in many of the best MSS., in nearly all the Yersons, and in some Fathers, and are cancelled by Griebb., Fritz., and Scholz, being supposed to have been introduced from Luke v. 31. There is, however, no sufficient authority to warrant their being cancelled:

мaӨทrai 'I $\omega$ àv
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18. oi $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ \$aptraiou ] Mill and Beng. would read ol \$apiraiot, from most of the best MSS. and Versions, which is edited by Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. But there is no sufficient authority for the alteration.

- $\sigma o l \mu a \theta_{\eta \tau a l}$ ] It is strange that almost all Commentators should take this ool as a Dative for Gienit. For although the Dative is used for the Genit., both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, yet only under certain circumstances, of which this is not one. Fritz. rightly remarks, that many such passages are either corrupt, or wrongly understood. And he adds, that unless a Dative can depend on the notion of the substantive, or be inserted by the bye, or be a Dativus commodi, or the like, it cannot be coupled with a substantive. He very properly takes the ool as the Nominative plural of ods, ori, qóv.

19. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ д̀ùvavтal oi viol тoü ע.] Campb. observes, that " on a subject such as this relating to the ordinary manners and customs which obtain in a country, it is usual to speak of a thing which is never done, as of what cannot be done." Whitby, too, observes that the term is used on any reasonable hindrance, though far short of improbability. 1. If the actions be incongruous or improper, as Luke xi. 7. 2. If the thing violates any rule of law or equity, as Deut. xii. 17. Acts x. 47. 3. If it be not agreeable to the Divine counsels, as Matt. xxvi. 42. 4. If any inconvenience arises, or other employment impedes it, an Mark iii. 20. 5. If there is any defect or fault in the object, as "Christ could do no mighty works because of their unbelief," Mark vi. 5. 6. If there is a disposition adverse to it, Gen. xxxvii. 4. Joh. xiv. 17.

 which is preferred by Mill and Beng., and edited by Griesb., Vat., and Scholz; but very undeservedly; for, as Fritz. observes, it can on no
account be admitted, the plural referring to the preceding म/ épat. $^{\prime}$ I would remark, too, that the testimony of the Versions is not of much weight, since in some of them the singular might be taken of time in general, and therefore be a free translation of the plural. As little reason is there for cancelling the кal just after, as is done by Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz, from many of the best MSS.; for the copula (as Fritz. obr serves) cannot be dispensed with.
 To the examples of this formula preceded by a negative sentence, adduced by Schleus. and Wahl, may be added Thucyd. i. 28.
-aipel-madaıō̃] The construction is, Td
 тoū $\pi a \lambda a \iota o \bar{u}$, 'its new supplement taketh (something) from the old (garment).' That the antients supplied $\dot{d} \pi \dot{\delta}$, is plain from its appearing in various positions in the passage, but, no doubt,
 $\pi \lambda$ ทipoo $\alpha$, (the supplemental portion), as it is explained by Hesych. On the full sense of these two verses, see Markl. in Recens. Synop.
20. $\beta \lambda_{\eta \tau \dot{e} o \nu]}$ scil. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota$; nam verbalia ex se fundere casus verborum, unde derivata sunt, tralatitium est. (Fritz.)
21. таражореиеоөаи-оторіцшу] Парат. is not here put (as many imagine) for жopevंertat ; nor is the sense of $\pi \alpha \rho a \pi$. $\delta \iota \alpha \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \sigma \pi$. what Abr., Pal., and Krebs say, 'to pass by near the corn fields.' The full sense is, 'to pass along through the corn fields;' the wapa perhaps being used because the paths were probably carried along one side of the fields.
 is, as Bezz and Schleusn. remark, an interchanged collocation, of which see examples in Glass Phil. Sacr. ii. 4241., (the primary notion being seated










 той $\sigma a \beta \beta$ áтоу.
xi. 13. 'O div moceiv is Hellenistic Greek (with
 the distinction between the use of the Active and Middle being, in the later writers, often neglected. The variation of construction in this verse is remarkable.
22. IDe Ti- EEeनTt] See! why are they doing on the Sabbath what is not lawful to be done (then),' or, 'how are they doing, how dare they do, \&c.
23. \%'re Xpeiav ioxe] 'when he was in great straits,' 'was pressed by necessity.' It is not merely synonymous, as many suppose, with the drainage following.
$26{ }^{\alpha} \pi{ }^{2}$ 'A $\beta \iota \alpha^{\prime} \theta_{\alpha \rho} \tau 0 \hat{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi$.] The sense of this disputed passage seems to be, 'during the High Priesthood of Abiathar.' But from the passage of the Old Testament alluded to, ( 1 Sam. xxi.6.), it appears that, at the period of the circumstance here adverted to, Ahimelech was High Priest ; and other passages show that Abiathar was son of Ahimelech. To remove this difficulty, many methods have been proposed. Some would cut the passage out altogether. Others admit that it was an error of memory in the Evangelist. These are alike inadmissible. Others endeavour to remove the difficulty by modifying the usual signification of $d \pi l$, or laying down others. But that is $t 00$ precarious, and indeed inefficient, to deserve attention. Several recent Commentators suppose that the Evangelist has followed the Rabbinical mode of citation, which consists in selecting some principal word out of each section, and applying the name to the section itself; e.gr. in Solomon-or Eli. So Rom. xi. 2. év 'Bia. and Mark xii. 26. dat fris Bátov. Thus the sense will be, 'in that portion of the book of Samuel where the History of Abiathar is related.' But this is not permitted by the collocation of the words; nor will $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i$ with the Genit. admit of such a signification. Neither is Abiathar called a High Priest in 1 Sam. xxi. 2. seq. Others think that father and son had two names, and that the father was also called Abiathar. But this solution is too manifestly made " for the nonce," and is grounded on no proof whatever. Equally arbitrary is the supposition of some, that Abiathar was the Sagan or Deputy to his father Ahimelech, and is therefore styled High Priest. This indeed is utterly refuted by the severe Historical touchstone applied by Fritz. Upon the whole, I am inclined to think, with Bp. Middlet., that a great deal of learning and ingenuity has been employed to remove a difficulty which does not exist. This, he says,
has arisen from imagining that the words of St . Mark, explained in the obvious way, would mean ' in the priesthood of Abiathar, a sense which, indeed, they will not admit. Without the Article, indeed, (continues he) such would have been the meaning, as in 1 Macc. xiii. 42. Luke iii. 2. è $\pi^{\prime}$ d $\rho \chi \iota \subset \rho$ écol. "Ava кal Kaıáфa. Demosth. i. 250. Thucyd. ii. 2. In fact nothing is more common in the Classical writers. " Now (argues the learned Prelate) in these examples the Article would imply, as in the case of Abiathar, that these persons were afterwards distinguished by their respective offices from others of the same name. And that the name Abiathar was not an uncommon one among the Jews, is certain. And this might render the addition fou d $\rho x$. natural, if not absolutely necessary. Thus the sense will be, that this action of David was in the time of Abiathar, the noted person who was afterwards High Priest. So Luke iv. 27.
 ledges that the $\delta \pi l$ must have its usual sense, (as taken of time), and he also maintains that
 High Priesthood of Abiathar.' He takes the sense to be, 'in tempore Abiatharis, pontificis,' i.e. one of the High Priests. But though that method equally removes the difficulty, yet it is inferior to Middleton's, which is supported by a tower of strength in the propriety of use in the Article.
24. $\dot{\delta}$ vide тoù $\left.d \nu \theta \rho \omega^{\prime} \pi o v\right]$ Grot., Campb., Wakef., Kuin., and Fritz. contend that the sense here is not Messiah, which is the general interpretation, but man. "For (says Camph.) as the last words are introduced as a consequence from what has been advanced, the son of man here must be equivalent to men in the preceding, otherwise a term is introduced into the conclusion which was not in the premises." This interpretation, however, though specious, seems unsound, and must by no means be admitted, as introducing an unwarrantably strong expression, which would lead to a laxity of opinion and practice as to the observance of the Sabbath, which our Lord could not mean to inculcate. Nor is it necessary so to interpret ; for, as I have observed on Matt. xii. 8., the wto te here may not be illative, but continuative, of which uses examples may be seen in Steph. Thes. and Hoogev. Partic. Or, with Maldon., it may be considered as completive. This view is strongly confirmed by the manner in which St. Luke introduces the
 the new interpretation is negatived by the cai
\％Matt． 12. 9.











that．in
25. 





（even）of the present passage，which has great force，and implies，as Doddr．justly observes， ＂t that the Sabbath was an institution of high importance，and may perhaps also refer to that signal authority which Christ，by the ministry of his Apostles，should exert over it，in changing it from the seventh to the first day of the week．＂ This was too（we may add）a delicate way of claiming to be the Messiah，as in the words uttered by our Lord on another occasion，＂There is here something greater than the Temple．＂ Moreover，the кupios，according to that inter－ pretation，would have to be taken in a sense which，though sometimes occurring in the early Classical writers，is perhaps never found in the later ones，and certainly never in the Sept．or the $\mathbf{N}, \mathrm{T}$ ．And to the above sense of vide moi
 adverse．

The reasoning seems to be this，that as the Sabbath was an institution meant for the good of man，the relaxation of the strict observance of it might，in some extreme cases，be justified， as in that of David，and in this of his disciples． Besides，if that were not the case，that His countenance and permission was sufficient au－ thority，for the Messiah is lord，\＆cc．That some enlightened Jews have seen that the Sabbath was not to be observed with a slavish minute－ ness，is plain from the following maxim cited by Wets．＂Servate Sabbatum，qua sanctum vobis； obis Sabbatum traditum est，et non vo traditi estis Sabbato．＂
III．2．таретทipovy］Mapatnpeì signifies 1．to keep one＇s eyes fixed upon（ $\pi \alpha \rho a)^{\prime}$ any person or thing．2．to watch，whether for a good，or（as generally）for an evil，and chiefly an insidious ，purpose．

3．${ }^{\text {E }}$＇$\gamma$ elope］sail．geavtóv．So nearly all the best MSS．read（for $\bar{\epsilon} \gamma \in \varphi$ at）；and this is adopted by nearly all the recent Editors．See Note on Mark ii． 9 ．
 English Commentators introduce here a Note of Camp．inculcating that＂in Scripture a nega－

Lion is often expressed by an affirmation of the contrary．＂．See the Note in question，which， however，is more ingenious than solid ；for it does not appear what bearing it has on the pres－ sent passage．Here there is an interrogation， which our Lord introduces，as being more si－ rited than a mere declarative sentence．He leaves themselves to decide the point．By the
 ing the cripple；and by какожо（ฑ）act，to the designs against his life，which the Pharisees were plotting even on the Sabbath．The words following $\psi v \times \dot{\eta} \nu\left(\right.$ life ）$\dot{\alpha} \pi{ }^{2}$ of the preceding．
5．$\left.\mu \varepsilon \tau^{\prime} \dot{\delta} \rho \gamma \bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}\right]$ It is not necessary here to dis－ cuss the question whether Christ really felt anger，or not，or what is the true definition of anger；for the word $\delta \rho \gamma \dot{\eta}$ does not here denote anger，but（as sometimes in the Classical mri－ tors）commotio anime，indignation，which may be defined，with $W$ hitby，＂a displeasure of the mind， arising from an injury done or intended to our－ selves or others，with a desire to remove the injury：＂This view is established by the word following бu入入uтоúmevos，which was，no doubt， meant to qualify and explain $\dot{\delta} \rho \gamma \overline{\mathrm{n}}$ s．av $\nu \lambda \nu \nu \pi$ ． signifies grieved in mind．Mcopwot．The word （from $\pi \omega$ pos，a hard piece of skin）signifies callousness，perversity．
－wis $\eta \dot{d} \dot{d} \lambda \eta \eta$ ］These words，which are omitted in several MSS．，（ some of them antient），most of the Versions，and some Fathers，are rejected by most Critics，and cancelled by almost all the Editors from Griesb．to Scholz，being supposed to be introduced from Math．xii．13．And when we consider that Mark perpetually abridges the accounts of Matthew，this seems very probable ＇AォокaӨı $\sigma \tau$ deva signifies to restore any thing to its former place or state，and is，in the Passive， by Hippocr，and the late Greek writers，and also the Sept．，used of restoration from sickness to health．It，however，originally had the addition of something corresponding to the wis if di $\lambda \eta$ of Matthew．So Hippocr．Epidem．p． 1222.
















8. ol tepl Túpov кal $\mathrm{\Sigma}$ เòmūa] Grot. rightly observes, that these are not the Tyrians and Sidonians, but those who inhabited the borders of Tyre and Sidon. See vii. 24.
9. eiжe тоis $\mu a \theta$ пrais] ' he directed his disciples.' Проккартер a., 'should attend upon him.': Пробкартєреї signifies 1 . to persevere in, and continue intent on any thing. 2. to artend on any person. So Acts viii. 13. קaxrio-
 several Classical passages cited by the Commentators. Fritz. thinks it very strange that the plasase should here be used of a thing. But, in fact, the thing is put for a person-a rower for the boat, exactly as in a kindred passage of





10. dӨкедंтevą] Brug., Newc., Kuin., and Fritz. rightly observe, that "this must have a plupperfect sense," "had healed," on which see
 much that they pressed or shoved upon him.' Máotcyas, ' $g$ rievous disorders.' The word properly signifies a scourge, but metaphorically any terturing affection, especially disease.
11. тทеنю Camer., Rosenm., and Kuin. take avé́ $\alpha a \tau a$ to denote the persons who were troubled with deemons. But, as Fritz. justly remarks, there is there ascribed to dæmons what the persons possessed by them did, because those persons were not their own masters, but were governed by the demons.

- öray aícdy ${ }^{\text {deccójet }}$ ] The sense is, 'as often as they saw him,' as Fritz. explains; though thot Commentator, shows that it is solocecistic, unless we write "ör' àv do. Perhaps the Evanselist 80 wrote, or, at least, so considered the conjunction in his mind.

14. dтoince] 'appointed.' So Apoc. i. 6. кal
 and sometimes in the later Classical writers. So
the Heb. עשם in 1 Sam. xii. 6. and sometimes the Latin facere, as in Cicero pro Plancio 4.
15. ${ }^{〔} \xi_{o v o i a v)}$ The word here signifies rather pouer (vim.) than authority, as most Commentators take it.
16. тр $\bar{\omega} \tau o \nu ~ \Sigma ı \mu \bar{\omega} \nu a] ~ I ~ h a v e, ~ w i t h ~ B e z a, ~$ Schmid, Glass, Schott, and Fritz., introduced this addition, on the authority of at least four MSS., as being necessarily required to complete the sense. And so Newc., Wakef., and Campb: translate. Without them there is (as Matthæi confesses) a manifest defect, or lacuna. And though that is supplied in various ways, in the MSS., yet in none satisfactorily, except in the above manner. The common reading cannot be defended. De Dieu and Kuin., indeed, maintain that it is a concisa et hians oratio, of which the sense is, 'And he appointed Simon, whom he (afterwards) called Peter.' But let the style of the Evangelist be as slovenly as they please to say, yet this would be an unparalleled negligence. Far better is it to suppose a lacuna, which may be best filled up in the foregoing manner. To that, however, a strong objection has been made, namely, that the clause was formed and introduced from Matth. x. 2. But that passage (as Fritz. observes) is very dissimilar. I cannot, however, help suspecting that the $\pi \rho \tilde{\omega} \tau 0 \nu$ was derived from that source; and I have little doubt but that the true reading is $\Sigma \iota \mu \bar{\omega} \nu a$ without the трш̄тov. So in the parallel passage of Luke vi. 14., (which Mark seems to have had in view),

 Métpov) кal 'A $\quad$ dofav, \&ce. This is plainly the origin of the passage of Mark. Besides, it is far more probable that a word should have slipped out than a clause. Thus we are enabled to account for the omission on the principle of homocoteleuton, or rather general similarity, for in Manuscript characters £ipøya is very like $\Delta a t \mu \dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{a} a$. That would cause the omission in some cases; though I have no doubt but that in others the omission of $\Sigma i \mu \omega \nu \alpha$ was occasioned by its standing by itself, and seemityon no
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part of the construction, though it belongs to the preceding ex ooinve. The insertion in the Cod. Vat. кal eтоinge סw'סека is plainly from the margin, where it was intended to indicate the Construction. It is probable that the Archetype of the Cod. Vat. had इıц̄̄̀va.
The words каl ézéもŋкe- Пéтроу are inserted parenthetically, because, in fact this surname was not given to Simon on the Mount, but afterwards. See Matt. xvi. 18. That it was not unusual for the Jewish Rabbis to give new names to their pupils, has been shown by Wets.
17. Boavep $\overline{\text { cs }}$ ] With this word the Commentators are much perplexed. One thing is certain, that it does not correctly represent the Hebrew or Syriac term. What that was, the Commentators are not agreed. Most think, with Jerome, that the true word is Bevepecin, from the Heh. בני רעם, for in Hebrew רעם continually signifies thunder. But this varies too much from the vestigia literarum. Others derive it from the Heb. בני רעש. But that deviates too far, and only signifies "Sons of noise," or sound. The best derivation seems to be that of Caninius, De Dieu, and Fritz., בני רנש, for Reges in Syriac and Arabic signifies thunder. Thus the word Boaveprès seems to be a slight corruption for Boavéeres. The reason for this appellation has been variously conjectured. See Lightf., or Horne's Introd. Vol. iv. 312.
 food, (by a common Hebraism), much less to attend to any thing else.
21. кal dкoи́баутes-aútóv] There are few passages on which Commentators are more divided in opinion than this. Several questions are involved in the discussion of the sense, 1 . who are the oi tap' aútoū ? 2. To what report does dкко́vaytes have reference? 3. What is the sense of $\dot{e} \xi_{\tilde{\eta}} \lambda \theta \sigma \nu$ and крат $\bar{\eta} \sigma a t$ ? 4. Who is it that are represented as saying $\dot{d} \xi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta$. On these
points I see no reason to abandon the opinions which I propounded in Recens. Synop. Fritz., after a very long and learned discussion, determines (as I had myself done) that the best interpretation is that of the antient and many eminent modern Commentators, as Grot., Bera, Kypke, Campb., Wets., Valckn., and Kuin., as follows-' When Jesus' kinsfolk (i. e. his mother and brothers, see v. 31.) had heard (that he was at Capernaum), they went out from their house, in order that they might lay hands on him ; for, said they, he is surely beside himself.' Fritz. remarks that the Greeks bay elvat Tapá rivos, 'to be of any one's nation or family;' and he adduces examples. That from Susanna v. 33. ëк $\kappa$ alov dè ol tap' aúvís. is quite decisive. 'Aкov́бavres signifies 'having heard of his being at Capernaum, and what was going on
 signifies 'to lay hands on and hold fast;' but does not necessarily imply violence, but sometimes friendly intentions, as in 2 Kings iv. 8. and
 is to be taken in a figurative sense for 'he is transported too far.' The word is often used in the Classical writers of vehement commotion or perturbation; and we have there both the complete and the elliptical phrase, the latter of which, however, is rare.
22. $\left.\mathrm{B}_{6 \in \lambda \zeta \text {. }} \mathrm{X} \in i\right]$ i. e. he is possessed of Beelzebub.

23-29. In these verses is shown, 1. the absurdity of the charge; and 2. the wickedness of it, which is of so deep a dye, that it will never be forgiven. 'Ev rapaßo入aîs, 'in language dealing chiefly in comparisons from known things and familiar objects.'
24. ' $\phi$ ' غ́avtrì $\mu \in \rho$.] M $\epsilon \rho!\zeta \in \sigma=a t$ signifie properly to be separated, and, from the adjunct, to be at variance, and in opposition. In which case it carries with it the regimen of verbs signifying opposition.

 סúvataı ov́dєis тà $\sigma \kappa \epsilon u ́ \eta ~ т o \hat{v} ~ i \sigma \chi u \rho o \hat{v}$, ai $\sigma \epsilon \lambda \theta \omega ̀ \nu$ ais тìv


















26. кalel $\dot{\text { E }}$.] The cal is said by Ruin. to be for oürcos. But Fritz. shows that it retains the usual force.
27. out סúvatat ousels] A great number of MSS., (many of them ancient), some Versions, and the Edit. Princ., have ousels dóvazat, which is edited by Griesb., Math., and Scholz; but injudiciously; for the common reading, as being the more difficult, is to be preferred, and is very properly restored by Tittm., Vat., and Fritz. This idem of the double negative is frequent in Scripture, (as Luke ix. 2. Joh. vi. 63. ix. 33.), but is generally stumbled at, more or less, by the scribes. Toul ioxupoù. The force of the Article here is that of insertion in Hypothesis. See Middles. Gr. Gr. C. III. \$2. 1.
28. kali ai] So several of the best MSS. read for cal. And so Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. edit; and very properly; for it is far easier to account for the omission than for the insertion of the al.
 riv signifies 1. to utter calumnious or abusive expressions against men; in which sense it is frequent in the Classical writers. 2. to utter profane ones against God, in which sense it is rare in the Classical writers, though some examples are adduced by the Commentators.
 Which Grot., Mill, Giriesb., Rosenm., and Kain. would read, is a mere emendation of the common reading to improve the antithesis; which, however, is unnecessary. See Math. and Fritz.
30. art èncyov-éXci] These are, as Beza,

Casaub., Cast., Grot., Heupel, Kuin, and Fritz. rightly observe, the words of the Evangelist, not of our Lord. Indeed so the passage was taken by Euthym.
31. ${ }^{\text {en }} \rho$ Xovacat o ivy The ivy is here, as often (like ergo sometimes in Latin) resumptive, taking up the thread of the narrative from ver. 21. Oi
 most of the Versions, have $\eta \dot{\mu} \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \rho$ cal oi $\dot{\alpha} \dot{d} \epsilon \lambda$ $\phi$ ot, which is edited by Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. But there is no sufficient authority for the change, which may, with Wets. and Fritz. (who very properly retain the common reading) be accounted for from a wish to do honour to the mother of Christ. By ${ }^{2} \xi_{\infty}$ is meant, not outside of the house, but outside of the crowd.
32. ^al oi doe入фoi $\sigma o u$ ] Many MSS. and the Edit. Princ. add cal al dide入фaí $\sigma o v$, which words are edited by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz, but are, with better reason, rejected by Kuin. and Fritz.
35. d $\delta \in \lambda \phi o ́ s \mu o v]$ i. e. as it were $m y$ brother, fratris loco, in summo apus me pretio, explains Fritz.
 most Commentators. But, as Fritz, shows, the phrase must have its full force. The sense is, 'He began to teach by the sea, and then by the increasing crowd of auditors, he was compelled to embark on board the boat, (mentioned supra iii. 9.), and to teach the people seated on board in the sea,' i.e. a short distance off the land. With the use of $\partial \nu$ with $\theta a \lambda \alpha \sigma^{2} \sigma_{2}$ compares Prov, xxiii. 34.
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 of expression peculiar to Mark.
4. Toù oùpavoū] Omitted in very many MSS., (nearly the whole of the antient ones), most of the Versions, and the Edit. Princ. It is rejected by Mill, Beng., Wets., Matth., Griesb., T'ittm., Yat., Fritz., and Scholz; and very properly ; for the words were, no doubt, introduced from the other Gospels, though omitted by Mark, for brevity's sake.
7. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \varepsilon \dot{\alpha} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta a s]$ The Article is here found, as being employed in a general sense for thorny ground.

- ка́ртоу oúк èठшке] i.e. did not yield fruit. This was not necessary to be said of the former seed sown; but here it was with reason expressed, since the first growth justly afforded a hope of a prosperous increase. (Rosenm.)

 which is found in some antient MSS.; but, doubtless, from a gloss. The active is used by the later, and especially the Hellenistic writers; the middle by the earlier. "Eфєpey ēv. This use of êv, serving to enumeration, is Hebraic. See 1 Sam. x. 3. Exod. xviii. $3 \& 4$.

9. aiurois] The word is omitted in very many MSS., (includine almost all the best), nearly all the Versions, the Edit. Princ., and almost all the early Editions, and is cancelled by nearly every Editor, from Wets. to Scholz.
10. кат $\left.\alpha^{\prime} \mu \dot{v} v a ̨\right]$ Sub. $\chi$ ćpas, apart, what is in a manner at (a separate) part. The expression occurs both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Ol mepl autdy, 'those that were about him.' By this expression are designated the stated attendants on our Lord's ministry, his regular disciples, probably (as Euthym. thinks) the Seventy disciples. So Jamblich. Vit. Pyth.
11. ol $\pi \in \rho \frac{1}{}$ rd̀ äyò $\rho a$, Pythagoras's disciples. The construction $\epsilon \rho \omega \tau \tilde{\alpha} \nu \quad \tau เ \nu a \tau t$ deserves attention., Mapaßo入riv,' the meaning of the parable.'
12. ס́dóorat] 'it is granted' [by Divine grace]; not obtigit, as Wets. renders; which is an unjustifiable curtailment of the sense. Tois ${ }^{6}$ Ew, i. e. to those who are most removed from intimate connexion with me, and acceptance of my religion. This name the Jews used to give to the Heathens, as being removed from covenant with God. Our Lord, therefore, as Whitby remarks, seems to hint to them that in a short time the kingdom of God would be taken from them, and they themselves be the of $\tilde{\varepsilon} \xi_{w}$. This mode of speaking is also found in the Rabbinical wri-
 т $\bar{n} \mathrm{~s}$ ßac. тoü $\theta_{\text {eov̄, such as God might see fit }}$ to reveal; for there is, as Grot. remarks, a reservation of some of the arcana of the Divine dispensations and the events of predictions. Císetal, fiunt, are done, i. e. are expressed.
 have almost universally taken the lva for ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{grt}$, quia, or ita ut. But fritz. more correctly explains it eo consilio, ut. Our Lord means that the prophetical saying of Isaiah will be made good. The sense is, 'To the multitude all things are propounded by the intervention of parables, with the intent that (as the prophet says) since they have eyes and ears perfect, and yet see not, nor understand, they may not repent and obtain forgiveness of their sins.' The expression $\beta \lambda \dot{\prime} \boldsymbol{m}^{2}$. кal $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ ldwor is (as Le Clerc observes) a proverbial one, and relates to those who might see, if they would use their faculties, that which they now overlook, through inattention and folly.




















 xpónov "Eфupor eiкn̄ ráyта.
The words cal $\dot{\alpha} \phi e \theta_{\hat{\eta}}$ abroîs $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \mu$. the Commentators consider as an explanation of those of Isaiah cal lóroomat aurous; the Hebrews viewing all severe disorders as the punishmont of sin. And that those were really such under the Mosaic dispensation, A bp. Magee (on Atonement, Vol. r. p. 433.) thinks we may fairly infer from Joh. V. 14. But the Hebrew is it K , in, 'ne gens saiva evadat.' For, as Fritz. observes, the Heb. אघר, (as also the Chaldee cora), to heal, often signifies to forgive, offences being compared with wounds and disorders. See Ps. iii. 3 .
13. kail rear] 'And how then!' Among the other significations of cal when prefixed to interrogations, is that of drawing a consequence, as in Matt. iii. 14. and here. By the rojas (I agree with Fritz.) is meant, not 'all (other),' but, ' all (such as it behoves you to know).'
14. is नreipcov-बreipet] $A$ brief and popular form of expression, of which the sense is, "The sower [mentioned in the parable] is to be considered as one sowing the word [of God].'
 owrapóvres. This kind of ellipsis is frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. Orov, for otis, whom, which is, indeed, found in some MSS. and the Syr., but is doubtless a gloss. So the Latin rbi for in quo. Such is the way in which most Commentators take the passage.
15. duoters] i.e. by a similar mode of explanation.
16. d $\lambda \lambda \AA$ тро́бкаıро̨ e.] 'but are only femporary (hearers).'
17. otto cloth] These words are omitted in many MSS., (including several antient ones), and also in the Fd. Princ. and Beng., several Versions, and some Fathers, and are cancelled
by Wets., Math., Tittm., Vat., and Fritz., which last Editor proves that this is the only way of emending the passage, though others are offered by the MSS., one of which is adopted by Griesb., namely, to read cal adios, for the former каl ойтo.
18. roúrou] Griesb. and Fritz. cancel this, on the authority of some MSS., as being introdiced from the other Gospels. But the sense will scarcely dispense with the word, and the custom of the N.T. requires it. It is, besides, absent from so very few MSS. that the omission may be thought accidental, or introduced elegantim gratian, for the passage reads better without it. Fritz. adduces Math. xiii. 39. as an example of the absence of the pronoun; but it may be better dispensed with there, since the same expression with the tov́roy had occurred a little before. The Genit. here has the same sense as if with rept.
 terpreters take $\alpha \pi d \tau \eta$ for rep $\%$ is. But there is no reason to abandon the common interpretsion 'the fallaciousness of riches,' expressive of those various fallacies which accompany riches, and induce disappointment, and throw a veil over the heart as to the real state of happiness here and hereafter.
 be, 'the desires exercised about (circa) the rest of the gaudes of life' (to use an old English terra). Aостגं has reference to той тגоט̈тov, and alludes to honours and sensual gratificatons; what are called by St. Paul the Tiv oapkds extovpiat, and by Luke viii. 14. मiooval rout Blow. There may be (as Grot. suggests) an euphemism, since sensuality of every kind is adverted to. The recent Commentators regard the тepl тà 入oเรั่ as put for тө้̄ 入oเтติข. But that is unnecessary.
19. rapadíx orval] ' receive and entertain it,
j Matt. 5. 15. Luc. 8.16. et 11. 33.
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assent to it." "Ev totáкovтa, \&c. There is something harsh in this, instead of which we should expect $\kappa$ Is. The best way of accounting for it is to suppose, (with Grot and Fritz.), that the Evangelist suddenly returns back from the thing and the explication to the parable.
20. aürois ] i.e. the disciples, not the people at large. Compare vv. 21, 24, 26. and Luke viii. 16-18. And although vv. 21-25 are brought forward in another sense in Matth. v. 15. x. 26. vii. $2 \& 13$., yet proverbial sententia like this are (as Grot. observes) applicable in various views. It is (to use the words of Whitby) as if Christ had said: 'I give you a clear light by which you may discern the import of this and other parables; but this I do, not that you may keep it to yourselves, and hide it from others, but that it may be beneficial to you, and by you be made beneficial to others; and that having thus learned, you may instruct them how they ought to hear, and to receive the word heard in good and honest hearts, ver. 20. And though I give you the knowledge of these mysteries of the kingdom of God (катaцóvas) privately, I do it not that you may keep them so, for there is nothing thus hid, which should not be made manifest, neither was any thing made secret by me, but that it should afterwards come abroad.'

- $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau$ ] 'num quid.' An adverb sometimes involving affirmation, sometimes negation, (as here), in which latter case Hoogev. considers as emphatic. The nouns $\lambda \dot{\prime}$ र́vos, $\mu$ óorov, « $\lambda i \nu \eta \nu$, and $\lambda u x \nu i a \nu$ have the Article on the principle of denoting things of which there is generally but one of a sort in a house. "EpXevas, for $\phi \notin \rho \in \tau a l$, ' is brought.' Neuter for passive, by an idiom common to both Greek and Latin, as spoken of letters; though occurring also in other



For dxite日 $\hat{p}$ several MSS. (some of them antient,) and Theophylact have $\tau \in \theta \hat{\eta}$, which was proposed by Mill, and edited by Griesb., Knapp, and Fritz. But there is not sufficient authority for the alteration, which seems to be a mere emendation of the Alexandrian school. As little ground is there for the omission of the $\tau \iota$ just afterwards by the same Editors. The $\tau t$ could scarcely be dispensed with in the plain style of the Evangelist, though it might more elegantly be omitted. It was therefore cancelled by the emendatores, and carelessly omitted, on account
of the preceding $\tau t$ in iovi, by the scribes of the ordinary MSS.

By the $\kappa \lambda i \nu \eta \nu$ must be understood the couch, (like our sofa), which, as Grot. obeerves, had such a cavity as to admit of a candelabrum being put under it, nay, it seems, any thing much larger; indeed, from the citations adduced by Wets., it appears to have been used by the antients as a common hiding-place, or lurking hole.
 An elliptical form for oùdè d'
 no reason to adopt any one of the various readings, which have sprung from ignorance of the ratio phraseologim. See Fritz., who rightly observes that $\dot{\delta} \dot{\operatorname{tav}} \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \phi a \nu$. ought to be taken in universum, for 'quodcunque non in lucem prolatum fuerit.'
 thing perplexed about this verse, which has given rise to several readings, and induced Editors to adopt various expedients to make all right. Griesb. and Tittm. expunge the clause кal тробтe日ríerat-dкovovatv, with a few MSS. And Vat., from some MSS., cancels the tois $d \kappa$. But it has been fully shown by Fritz. that neither emendation can be received; and he himself edits $\beta \lambda$ éтете, тı dкоиете, каl тро-

 dation the words are placed more logically, and the sense more neatly expressed. But as there is no direct authority for the change, and as the Evangelist is obviously not characterised by neatness and exact correspondence of the members of a sentence, such as this emendation imparts, it ought not to have been introduced into the text.
The $\tau i$ here answers to the $\pi \bar{\omega} s$ of Luke.



26. Fritz. well observes, that in ver. 26-32. there is a continuation of our Lord's discourse, and addressed to the people at large. The following parable is recorded only by Mark. On its bearing and application Commentators differ; some, as Whitby and Fritz., referring it to the seed which fell on good ground, in the preceding parable of the sower. But others, as Mackn., think the correspondence in many reapects fails;







and they are of opinion，that it should be taken in connexion with the preceding verses，and was intended to prevent the Apostles from being dis－ pirited，when they did not see their labours attended with success．
27．кaөcüdy val dүaipyrat，\＆ic．］This expres－ sion（in which the caөcúdn refers to עúcra，and the eq eipqtas to rimépav）is like that of Psalm
 an image of security and confidence．＇$\Omega_{s}$ ，＇in such 2 manner as．＇
28．aivoцátท］The word properly signifies self－moved，and is here，as often in the Classical writers，used of that energy of nature，which is independent of human aid．Kaproфореї．This is generally taken for фépet；the каржо being inert，as in Dod．Sic．p．137．д длтлоя－кар－ тофореî tiv oivov．But Beza，Misc．，and Fritz． more properly give it the full sense fruges fort， and take 中éper from it in the next clause． Xóprov，blade．For want of some such definite term，the Greeks and Romans used the same word as denoted grass．The words Xóprov and oráxuv are put in the singular，because they are used in a general sense，which，however，implies plurality：ミrá que properly，as here，denotes the ear in its green state，so called from the peculiarly erect form it then has．Пौripn $\sigma$ iron， the complete perfect grain．So Genes．xii． 7. －тахи́es т入pipets．
 sage the antient Translators are so perplexed that they either give versions which wander from the sense，or else they express it in a general way by，＇when the crop is ripe．＇The best mode of interpretation is that recommended in Recens． Synop．，namely，（with Beza，H．Steph．，Heupel， Wolf，Guin．，and Fritz．，）to suppose an ellipsis of caurdv，as in the case of many other actives to which use imparted a reciprocal sense；of which Fritz．adduces as examples крúxтety，

 adoüvat，which，though it does not occur in the Classical writers，is found in Hellenistic Greek；
 dione（which did not deliver up itself，as we say surrender）toils vioĩs＇I $\sigma \rho a^{\eta} \lambda$ ． 1 Pet．ii． 23. тapedíou（＂he committed himself＇）de ta apivovt doustios．The question，however，is， to whom the fruit is to be understood to yield itself up，and deliver its increase ？To the reaper， almost all the Commentators say．But I prefer， with Fritz．，to refer it to $\tau \bar{\varphi} d \nu \theta \rho \omega^{\circ} \pi c o$ ，taken from the preceding．Thus also of ${ }^{\circ} \nu \theta$ pesos must
 to $\delta \rho$ ézayov，it is put，by a seemingly popular metonymy，for＇he sendeth those who may put in the sickle，＇i．e．the reapers．So，in a very
similar passage of Joel iii．13．еॄаттобтє\גaтe

 кal Өapígov．Of this idiom the Commentators have adduced no example from the Classical writers．For the Latin phrase immittere falcem which they adduce，and that of xpooq＇́ $\operatorname{sec\nu }$ to ठ $\rho$ é ${ }^{\text {a nov }}$ ，which I have cited in Recens．Synop．， are only used of the reaper，not the husband－ man．
31．ко́кк＜0］The greater part of the MSS．， （especially the ancient ones），together with the Editio Prince．and other ancient Editions，and some Versions，and Fathers，have кóккоע，which is adopted by Mill and Wets．，and edited by Math．，Griesb．，and others down to Scholz．； except that Fritz．retains the common reading； and，I think，very properly；for（as he shows） it is otherwise scarcely possible to justify the construction．And although кóккоу may seem to be the more difficult reading，yet，as it appears from the Greek Commentators，there is reason to think that ко́кксе was altered into кóккоу ex interpretatione．Besides，it may be added，as the words are so very much alike，the $t$ adscript and the $\nu$ being perpetually confounded，Manu－ script authority will here have but little weight． Mark iv．31．\＆32．On the subject of this Sinapi Mr．Frost，for the purpose of removing what appears to him a difficulty and objection connected with the present passage，has pro－ pounded an hypothesis，certainly ingenious，but which needs authentication from the works of Eastern travellers．Indeed it appears unneces－ sary for the commendable purpose in view． Every enlightened Interpreter will see how un－ critical it were to press 80 much as Mr．Frost has done on the expression＂least of all seeds．＂ It is sufficient if the smallest mustard seed be among the least of seeds known in Palestine； for it is plain that the tobacco could not be here contemplated，as it was not known till the dis－ covery of America．And the Forglove was pro－ badly not known in Palestine．It is plain that тáv Tao must not be pressed upon；for the Heb． ל $\boldsymbol{\partial}$ is often similarly pleonastic．Thus it is omitted in the parallel passage of Matthew．

Again，yivenat dévópov may very well be taken，by a popular hyperbole，for＇it becomes， as it were，a tree，＇especially as from a com－ parson of the parallel words of Matthew，tote i $\kappa \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \delta o u s \mu \sigma \chi$ al cvs，it is plain that the sense must be，＂that which branches out widely，like a tree．＂Besides，the statements of Dr．A．Clarke make it certain that this plant sometimes grows to a height of 15 feet，which may very well allow it to be a shelter for birds；and the кaтaбкпроin civ lois к入ádos aútoū of Matthew is well px－










Matt. 8. 18, 23
Luc. 822.










aúтой катабкŋעоӣ̀ of Mark. As to what Mr. F. calls " the impossibility of an annual plant becoming a shrub, much less a tree," it is too farfetched an objection todeserve the least attention.

Finally, Mr. Frost's hypothesis seems to be negatived by the words ör $\alpha, \dot{\partial} \dot{\varepsilon} \alpha \dot{u} \xi \eta \theta \hat{\eta}, \gamma i v e r a \iota$ $\pi \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \quad \tau \omega \bar{\omega} \lambda \alpha \chi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \nu \omega \nu, \mu \in i \zeta \omega \nu$, for surely the term $\lambda a x$, is only applicable to a plant, not to a tree. That some properties are common both to the Sinapi and to the phytolacca dodecandria is, therefore, insufficient to establish Mr. Frost's position.
 of these words Commentators are divided in opinion; but some of the best antient and modern ones are, with reason, agreed that it is as follows: 'as they had the ability and capacity of hearing them, and in such a way as they could profit by them,'
34. éné ${ }^{2}$ ve mávta] gave solutions and explanations of every thing. ' Emblúciv, both in the Classical and Hellenistic Greek, often (as the Hebr. פת ר and the Latin solvere) has this sense. Its primary signification is to untie a knot. The Hebrew term seems to be derived from what I consider as the more primary one, פפתה to open or loose what is shut or bound, whence התמפ, a key, literally an opener.
 the interpretation of this passage Commentators are by no means agreed. Most suppose $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ t $\boldsymbol{0}$
 - After he had dismissed the multitude, his disciples took him, just as he was, (i. e. unprepared as he was, and without delay), on board the ship.' An interpretation ably supported by Rosenm. and Kuin. (see also Recens. Synop.), against the objections of Elsner and Kypke, whose own interpretations, however, are far more open to censure. I still think there is nothing
objectionable in the common one. Yet I am inclined to agree with Euthym. and some other antients, as also some of the modern Commentators, (as Fritz.), in joining év Tép $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda o c i c p}$ with ws $j \nu$, which is a more natural construction, and renders any enallage unnecessary. Thus the sense will be, that 'on the dismissal of the multitude, they carried him off, just as he was, in the boat (in which he had been teaching).' Thus the ws in will be for ws eIXe, which implies immediutely, without staying for rest, refreshment, or preparation: no doubt, because the evening was coming on.
$36 \mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$ aúroū] i.e. as Fritz. explains, with Jesus's boat. And he cites many examples of this idiom.
37. $\lambda a \bar{i} \lambda \alpha \psi$ ] a whirlwind, hurricane; for the antient Lexicographers explain it by $\sigma v \sigma \pi p o \phi r$; and Aristot. de Mundo, тveìma Bia\&ov, кal cl $\lambda o u ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \nu \kappa \alpha ́ \tau \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$ d́ $\nu \omega$. It seems derived from $\lambda a \iota$, very, and $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau \in \iota \nu$, to snatch, take off, carry away. 'Елє́ $\beta a \lambda \lambda \epsilon$ is to be taken in an intransitive sense for se injecerunt, irruebant. $\Gamma \in \mu i \zeta \in \sigma-$ $\theta a t$, was filled (namely with the waves). A very unusual ellipsis.
38. $\tau \hat{i} \pi \rho \dot{\prime} \mu \nu \eta]$ i. e. the place where the steersman sat, and the most commodious one for a passenger. Td т $\rho 0 \sigma \kappa \in \phi$., not a pillow, (as the Translators render), but the pillow. The Article has a peculiar force, denoting a particular part of the furniture of the ship. This seems to have been a leather stuffed cushion. It is certain that тробкеф ${ }^{\prime} \lambda a t o v$ not only denoted a pillow, but a cushion.
39. $\sigma \iota \omega^{\prime \pi} \alpha, \pi \in \phi$.] The asyndeton here is very suitable to the gravity of the occasion. If Valckn. had had the taste to perceive this, he would have suppressed his conjecture, that бcórra is a gloss. Fritz. compares the usual address of the heralds, ג̈кove, olya.

















41. Aeron] Not the disciples only, but the mariners also.
V. 2. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi=s$ d $\nu \boldsymbol{x \nu}$. $\alpha \kappa$.] Sub. $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. So
 is no such hypallage, as some Commentators suppose ; and Fritz., (with Pric., Grot., and E. V.), takes the $\delta \nu$ for $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu$, i. e. a man animated with, \&c.
3. riv кaтoiкทбเข] The Article refers to auroi understood; and the force of the Imperfeet in elev imports use and habit. Mעทíaaб. This, instead of the common reading $\mu \nu \eta \mu \epsilon i o t s$, is read in a great part of the MSS., (including nearly all the most antient ones), as also the Edit. Princ. and Beng. And it was preferred by Mill, adopted by Wets., and edited by Math., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. The common reading arose, no doubt, from ser. 2. The sepulchral monuments of the antients, especoaly in the East, were tolerably roomy vaults, and would be no indifferent shelter for maniacs. Indeed, from Dog. Laert. ix. 38. d $\rho \eta \mu \alpha \alpha^{\prime} c \infty$
 that they formed no contemptible habitations, and were sometimes used as such.
 chains for the feet ; by $\alpha \lambda$., those for the hands and body in general. $\Delta$ ceozāa $\theta a l$; had been torn asunder.' इuvterpí $\theta a l$, had been rubbed and crushed to pieces.
5. dy toîs-iv] This punctuation I have adopted, with the Vulg., Syr. Vers., E. V., Doddr., Wines, and Fritz., as being required by propriety. To place the comma after $\kappa \rho a ́ \zeta \omega \nu$, as is generally done, would yield a false sense. See Wiener's Gr. Gr. $\$ 39$ - The position es $\tau$ lois $\mu \nu$. kail \&v lois ofecoly for the common reading in roils opeoty cal iv coir $\mu \nu$., is found in many of the best MSS., and almost all the Versions, and is edited by Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz.
The circumstance of cutting himself with
sharp stones, instead of a knife, (which, of course, would not be granted him), is quite agreeable to the usual custom of maniacs, who tear their flesh, and cut it with whatever they can lay their hands on; of which Wets. adduces examples. Here, however, this was manifestly the result of demoniacal possession.
 as applied to God, occurs no where else in the Gospels, and only once elsewhere, namely, Heb. vii. 1., taken from Genes. xiv. 22. It caresponds to the Heb. עלין. The expressions seem to have been at first given with reference to the exalted abode of God, i.e. in Heaven. (So Iss. lxvi. 1. "Heaven is my throne, and earth my footstool)." Thus our word Heaven is rightly derived by H. Tooke from the past particip. of Heofan, to heave, lift up. The names may also refer to the supreme majesty of the Deity; and correspondent terms are found in the Theology of all the Pagan nations of antiquity. In the Old Testament, however, the above names are almost always given to distinguish the Deity from those who were called gods.
 denotes to put any one on his oath. See Note on Matt. xxvi. 63. and Math. Gr. Gr. But here (as Grot., Rosenm., and Kuin. have shown) it has the force of oro, obtestor te per Deum, and thus is equivalent to the déopai nov of Luke xviii. 28.

- $\mu \boldsymbol{j} \mu \epsilon$ ßaravínps] Some ancient Commentators, (as Theophyl.), and recent modern ones, (as Fritz., and myself in Recens. Synop.), ex' plain, "by compelling me to depart from the man." And, indeed, this interpretation is very agreeable to the context. But it is somewhat harsh, and is not permitted by the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke, from which it appears that the word is to be taken of the mode of torment, which was supposed to be apportoned to demons compelled to come out of















possessed persons, namely, the being compelled (as Luke expresses it) els $\tau$ riv ${ }^{2} \beta \nu \sigma \sigma o v ~ d \pi e \lambda$ exit, (see 2 Pet. ii. 4. and Apoc. ix. 1 \& 2 2 xi. 7, \&c.), a term applied by the Greeks to their Tartarus. The words of yer. 10., sal жарека́入et
 the first mentioned interpretation. But they are equally suitable to the other. The dæmons entreat that if they must depart from the man, they may at least not be compelled to abandon the country ; which was but a more modest form of preferring the first mentioned request, that he would not send them away to the place of torwent.
 them antient), and most of the Versions, read $\lambda_{\text {éyet }}$ aùp̄̄, which is preferred by Beng., and edited by Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. But there is no sufficient reason for the alteration.
- Ti бо九 бैоца] Spirits, both good and evil, are always represented in Scripture as having names, which, it seems, they assumed in accommodation to human infirmity. Be that as it may, our Lord did not ask the name through ignorance, but (as Euthym. suggests) to thereby elicit an answer, that the bystanders might have the more occasion to admire the stupendous power by which the miracle was wrought.
- Aeyeciv ] This word (from the name of a well known Roman body of troops) was often used by the Jews to denote a great number. That the term has that sense here, and not that of Chief of the Legion, is plain from the words following, and those of vv. $10 \& 12$.

10. aưoüs lie. himself and his fellows, who called themselves by the name Legion. "E $\xi_{\infty}$, for ÊKTós.
 ${ }_{\mathrm{o}}^{\mathrm{\rho} \eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ) is found in the greater part of the MSS., (almost all of them antient), nearly the whole of the Versions, and the Edit. Princ., confirmed by Lu viii. 32. dy Tệ of at. It is also adopted by Wets., Beng., Math., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. Yet the common reading is not, as Fritz. affirms, inepta; for the $\pi \rho \dot{\rho}{ }^{2}$ might
mean in, at, or by, as in many passages, which see in Schleusn. or Wahl. The mávres is omitted in very many MSS., (most, indeed, of the antient ones), and all the best Versions, and is cancelled by Griesb., Vat., Tittm., Fritz., aud Scholz.
11. кal èvilyouro] "were suffocated," ie. by drowning. So that it might be rendered ' were drowned,' as in a passage of Plutarch cited by Wets. Indeed our drown comes from the Saxon Druncrian, to choke. But that sense is inherent in the added words \&े $\tau \bar{j} \theta a \lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma y$. Those who adopt the hypothesis which supposes the demoniacs to have been lunatics, are here involved in inextricable difficulties; for the words of Mart (as Fritz. truly observes) can be no otherwise understood than as asserting that the demons ejected from the man really entered into the bodies of such of the swine as they chose, and \&c. 'Os added to numbers not quite definite, signifies quasi, something like, about.
12. oi de $\beta$ órкovtes] The participle has here the force of a substantive, as Matt. viii. 23. Lu. viii. 34. vii. 14. 'Axifycinav. This (instead of the common reading $\alpha \nu \eta \gamma \gamma$.) is found in several MSS., (some of them antient), and is edited by Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. I long hesitated to receive this reading, because, though propriety requires $d^{2} \eta \gamma \gamma$., not $\dot{\alpha} \eta \eta \gamma \gamma$., yet in such 2 writer as Mark, that is not decisive, and there are in the N.T. a few instances of $d \nu a \gamma \gamma$. for $d \pi a \gamma \gamma$., a signification which is noticed by Hesych. Yet I know none followed, as here, by els with an Accusative of thing for person; in which case बंтayy., which is a stronger term, seems requisite.
By tiv xódıy is meant the city of Gadara, and by sous dypous, the country around it, or (as some explain) the country villages. Of course, the place is put for the inhabitants.
 a popular mode of expression, meaning to examine into the reality of any reported occurrence.
13. Өecopoū̃t $\tau \dot{\delta}$ casion to adopt any of the changes here found in MSS. and supported by Critics; not even the
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cancelling of cal before l ratio $\rho$ évov, for it tends to strengthen the sense. And although there may seem an unnecessary addition in $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu$ d $\sigma \times \eta$ -
 yet the latter is far more significant; and there is a sort of climax. Render, ' they see the demoniac seated, both clothed and in his right mind; him (I say) that had been possessed by the demons who called themselves Legion.' The being seated is mentioned, as a mark of sanity of
 Most Commentators understand too $\beta$. of fear lest they might suffer a greater calamity; but it is rather to denote awe at the stupendous miracle.
 rally, and then] they fell to beseeching him, \&c. This sense of $\kappa$ al, like that of the Heb. 1 , is irequant in Scripture, and sometimes occurs th the Classical writers. T Tṑ joptóv a., 'their districe.'
14. Iva jo net' aùroū] 'might accompany him.' This was, as many Commentators suppose, from fear lest the demons should again enter into him.
 The reasons which influenced our Lord's refaisal have been variously conjectured, (see Theophyl., Euthym., Grot., Kuin., and Fritz.), any, or indeed all of which combined, may have had effect. Tows $\sigma o i s$, scil. olkeious, to be taken from oikoy.
15. тетоinкev] This reading (instead of the common one elmo( $\eta \sigma e \nu$ ) is found in the greater part of the MSS., (many of them ancient), some Fathers, and the Edit. Princ. ; and is, with reaeon, adopted by Beng., Wets., Math., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. Propriety, indeed, as well as MS. authority, would require the preterite; for (as Fritz. observes) "in the dispossessed person, the effect of the things which the Lord had done remained, but the compassion (denoted by ¡¡én $\sigma$ er $\sigma e$ ) is a thing
which would be transient." Yet éroinge occurs in the parallel place of Luke, from which it was
 there is no occasion to insert an or $\tau$, with Beza. It is better to suppose, with Grot., that these words are suspended on the preceding, so that öra may be repeated. Perhaps, however, Fritz. is right in accounting this a variation of constriction.
16. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi^{\prime}$ a $\left.\dot{u} \tau \delta \nu\right]$ Fritz. observes that the $\lambda \pi l$ corresponds to the German mach, and that the sense here is, 'ut cum indispiceretur.' And he subjoins several examples from the Classical writers.
 pertly signifies the president of a synagogue. But there was but one synagogue at Capernaum;
 in conjunction with Acts xiii. 15. and what we learn from the Rabbinical writers, we may infer, that in a Synagogue there was not only one who was properly President, but others, consisting of the more respectable members, who also bore the title, either as having exercised the office of President, or because they occasionally discharged the duties of the office, which were to preserve decorum and the legal form of worship, and to select and invite those who should read or speak in the congregation. See John's Biblical Archeology, and Vitringa Archisynagogos.
17. idoiv aürdv] ' when he had come in sight of Jesus.'
 last stage of disease.' The phrase dod $\tau$ cos exetv, which occurs only in the later Greek writers, is equivalent to the more Classical toxácoss eivai, or diakelöat. Examples of all which are adduced by Elsn., Wets., and Kypke.
 difficulty of construction, which some attempt to remove by supposing an hyperbaton. This
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however, would involve an unprecedented harshness. It is better, with Kypke, Kuin., and Fritz., (whose method is supported by the Syriac and Vulg. Versions), to regard the expression as a circumlocution for the Imperative, l $\nu \alpha$ with a Subjunctive being put for the Imperative, as in Ephes. v. 23. Thus the sense is, 'Come and lay thy hands upon her.' Yet some verb must be supplied at " $\nu a$, either $\dot{\delta} \dot{\prime} \mu \alpha<$, as is generally thought; or rather жаракал $\bar{\omega}$, taken in the senee of ঠóouat.
 is thought by Winer Gr. Gr. p. 134. a Hebraism; by others, a Latinism. But it is common to both Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. Thus the Greeks say eivat \&̀ $\nu$ עóre, (Soph. Aj. 270.), and the Romans in morbo esse.
18. $\pi o \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha} \pi a \theta o \bar{u} \sigma a]$ The expression is a strong one, (like the "diu a medicis veratos" of Celsus), yet when we consider the ignorance of Jewish Physicians, and the various nostrums prescribed in this case, (on which see Lightf.), many of which would be nauseous and strong medicines, and all of them injurious to a habit of body so languid as in this disease, we may conceive that her sufferings would be great. There may be something sarcastic in the word $\pi o \lambda \lambda \omega \bar{\omega}$, with which the Commentators compare the saying of Menander, $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \bar{\omega} \nu$ La $\tau \rho \bar{\omega} \nu$ etooòos $\mu^{\prime}{ }^{\alpha} \pi \omega^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu$. Here, indeed, we may reverse the saying of Solomon, that in a multitude of counsellors there is safety.

- aüvís] This, (for éautis), which is read in most of the best MSS. and Theophyl., and rightly edited by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz; since the common reading doubtless arose from an attempt at emendation produced by a sense of difficulty. See the Varr. Lectt. The phrase may (as Fritz. suggests) best be explained by regarding it as one of those many in which the $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha$ with a Genit. does not in sense differ from a simple Genitive. $\Delta a \pi a \nu \eta \dot{\sigma} \alpha \sigma a$ rá̀va; ' having expended her whole substance.
- eis $\tau \mathrm{d}$ Xeîpon e e $\lambda \theta_{o u}$ ga] Literally, ' having come into a worse condition.' This use of eis or $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi l$ with adjectives of the Comparative degree, importing 'for the better' or 'for the worse,' is frequent in the best writers.
On the construction in ver. 25-27., (which is somewhat anomalous), Fritz. well remarks, that
 thing to do with the preceding ones oüra and
$\dot{e} \lambda \theta 0 \bar{\sigma} \sigma a$, but are put dंбvעdéccos. The difficulty may, however, he thinks, be removed by con-
 e $\lambda$ Ooüa as quasi parenthetice, and showing the nature of the disease, Thus кal $\gamma$ vun $\tau / 5$ will
 for $\tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta_{e} \kappa a l$, \&cc. That, however, is so like rewriting the sentence, that it is perhaps better to consider the whole as one of the many examples of anacoluthon which occur not only in the N.T., but also in the best Classical writers, especially Thucydides and his imitators.

28. ${ }^{2} \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ] Several MSS. and some Latin Versions add $\bar{\epsilon} \nu$ davty̆, which Fritz. thinks so indispensable to the sense that he receives the words into the text; and he calls in question the examples which have been adduced of a similar brevity of expression in $\lambda$ é $\gamma \in \omega$ and the Heb. אמר. But whatever propriety may dictate, and the usage of the best writers confirm, certain it is, that in the popular and familiar phraseology of most languages the idiom is found; though it rarely, if ever, occurs, except when, from the circumstances of the case, no mistake can arise from the omission in question. The same ignorance or forgetfulness of the extent to which ellipsis is carried in the popular modes of speech in every language, has occasioned many other Critical lapses in the same very learned and acute Philologist.
29. $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \eta \rho \dot{\nu} \nu \theta_{\eta} \eta \dot{\eta} \pi \eta \gamma \eta{ }^{2}$ т. a.] Campb. translates ' the source of her distemper.' But this is neither a correct version nor a good paraphrase. $\Pi_{\eta \gamma \dot{\eta}}$ must be taken in a physical sense, though not in that proposed by Fritz. Nor is it much to the purpose that the Philological Commentators heap up examples of da<púcov rin $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ ì or x $\eta$ ryai. Kuin. and Fritz. rightly observe that ทं $\pi \eta \gamma \dot{\eta}$ тoú aïpaтos aúvīs must be closely kept together, and that $\pi \eta \gamma \eta \dot{\eta}$ тoù ${ }^{2} / \mu$. is for püars qou ai $\mu$., answering to the Heb. מקר דמים in Levit. xii. 7. \& xx. 18., a bloody flux. This is placed beyond doubt by the expression of Luke
 ing is 'her flux of blood,' \&c.; and this sense is confirmed by the use of the singular.

 tois oтadayuois. It is plain (as Fritz. observes) that the woman was then suffering under the disorder in its greatest violence. Iavat, 'that sbe had been healed;' for it is the preterite, not the present (lärat). "Eyve is a very

















significant term, and denotes full conviction from actual experience. Hence, too, we may see the stupendous nature of the miracle; for, as Grot. observes, " no one can naturally all at once recover from an inveterate malady, but vestiges of the disorder in its gradual retreat will long remain."
 given rise to much discussion. One thing is plain, namely, that from hence, and from Luke vi.9., it appears the power of performing miracles was not, with our Saviour, as in the case of the Prophets and Apostles, adventitious, (in consequince of which they ascribed their miracles to God), but inherent in him by his Divine nature. This, however, is but an inference from the words, in discussing the sense of which, even the best Commentators have much (but vainly) perplexed themselves and their readers. It is needless to advert to the unhallowed speculations of those who refer them to animal magnetism; nor can those be commended who ascribe the cure to an effluvium, or emanation; though Fritz., after a long examination of the force of the words, thinks that they mean, 'Jesus knowing vim salubrem effurisse $\epsilon$ corpore.' It is best (as I have pointed out in Recens. Synop.) to suppose the words not meant to be taken in a physical sense, or to teach us the mode whereby the miracle was performed. We may consider it as a popular man-
 used of the working of miracles), and therefore not to be rigorously scrutinized, or bound down to Philosophical precision, but only importing, that Christ was fully aware that a miracle had been worked by his power and efficacy. The sentence is, however, obscured by ellipsis and hyperbaton. The construction is, $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \gamma \nu$ outs $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$

 ; miracles which was inherent in him,
had gone out of him,' as it were by the performance of a miracle through him. This force of div $v a \mu t \nu$ is indicated by the article, from inattention to which many of the best Commentators take riv dúvautv to simply signify 'a miracle;' which obliges them to interpret $\epsilon \xi \in \lambda \theta$. in the farfetched sense ' vim exercuisse.'
 peculiar to the N. T.
30. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi$ ' $\alpha \dot{v} \tau \hat{\eta}$ ] ' in, or by her;' equivalent to, 'unto her.' ila $\sigma a \nu$ riv d $\lambda$., i. e. as Middlet. explains, 'the whole truth respecting the affair in question.' Fritz., however, renders, 'the whole affair as it happened.' 'The fact is, that in this absolute use of the phrase, (with which Fritz. compares Demosth. тávтa yap elpriбeral $\tau d \lambda \eta \theta_{\bar{\eta}} \pi \rho d_{s} \dot{\dot{v} \mu \hat{\alpha} s) \text {, there is an ellipse of } \tau o \bar{u}, ~}$ ep you, or the like. But when it is not absolute, the ellipse is unnecessary, being supplied in the words following ; as in Thucyd. vi. 87. el
 $\mu e \theta a$.
31. Unarm els elprivnv] This and the kindred phrases ropeúєoөat, and $\beta a \delta i \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ els cloíjuv were founded on the Heb. לכי לשלח, and were forms of affectionate or condescending valedicton, and mean, as Fritz. explains, 'i secund mine,' 'Go in God's name.'
 literally, 'from the President's,' i. e. his house, (for he was now with Jesus.) So Joh. xviii. 28.
 idiom is found both in Greek and Latin, and indeed in modern languages.
32. клaiovtas кal di.] These words are excgetical of $\theta \delta \rho \rho \cup \beta o \nu$. 'A $\lambda a \lambda \alpha$ Catv from $\tilde{a} \lambda \alpha \lambda a$, (whence our halloo) seems to be akin to the Heb.
 noted the shout uttered by the soldiers of all the antient nations, previous to battle. 'A入a入d'̧ety. however, was sometimes used by any shrill vociferation, especially of grief, as in Jerem.




















34．\＆47．and Eurip．Elect．843．ทi $\sigma \pi \alpha \iota \rho \subset \nu$ ， ทi入a $\lambda \alpha \xi{ }^{2}$ ．
 ＇having ordered all to be removed，＇Jesus re－ tained just so many as were sufficient to prove the reality of the cure．To have permitted the presence of more might have savoured of osten－ tation．For $\ddot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \nu \tau \alpha s, \pi \alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \alpha s$ is found in very many MSS．and the Edit．Princ．，and is adopted by Beng．，Wets．，Mill，Griesb．，Tittm．，Vat．， Fritz．，and Scholz．The difference is，that

41．Ta入i $\theta \dot{\alpha}$ кoü $\mu t$ ］Syriac words，of which the former signifies a girl；and the latter is the Imperative of $\square$ p，to rise．
 of expression importing，＇that nothing of this should be made known．＇The order，however， could not be meant to enjoin perpetual secrecy， but present suppression，to avoid making a con－ course and raising a tumult．ETwe סo解vas aivin中ayeiv．Eltre is for diécake．On the syntax see Winer＇s Gr．Gr．$\$ 38$ ．With respect to the thing itself，it is righty remarked by Grot．，that the order was given that it might be apparent that the maid was not only restored to life，but to health．

V1．1．$\pi a \tau \rho i \delta a$ auroū］＇the place where he was brought up，＇namely，Nazareth．
2．кal yevouévou $\sigma a \beta \beta$ ．］The sense（on which the Commentators are not quite agreed）seems to be，＇on the Sabbath day；＇$\gamma$ yev．being for óvros．This is confirmed by the readings（glosses though they be）of the Cod．Cantab．and some other antient MSS；＇Aкoíovtes，＇on hearing him， having heard him．＇Fritz．renders it auditores． But that would require the Article．${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \xi \in \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \sigma$－

 the sense contigerunt．A fuller account of this transaction is given by Luke iv．16．seqq．Tis
 The tos signifies quanam．The öt just after is omitted in the greater part of the MSS．，or＂$/ \nu \alpha$ put in its place．And it is cancelled by Matth．， Griesb．，Tittm．and Scholz；but is retained and ably defended by Fritz．，who remarks，that＂all the various readings are only so many corrections of librarii，who did not comprehend the argumen－ tation from miracles to prove divine wisdom； which is well pointed out by Grot．＂The sense is，＇Whence have these things fallen to the lot of this man，and what is this wisdom given him from above，that［not only he teaches us the way of salvation，but］even such miracles［as we have heard related］are performed by 末im．＇$\Delta a \dot{a}$ $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \quad \chi \epsilon \rho \bar{\omega} \nu$ ，by Hebraism（like 7 ）for $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{i}^{\prime}$ au่тoü．
3．$\dot{\delta} \tau$ éxтшov］Some MSS．have d toû Téктovos viós．But this is rejected by all the Editors except Fritz．，who are，with reason，agreed that it was introduced from St，Matthew，and sprung from those who wished to consult the dignity of our Lord．That our Lord，however，was a carpen－ ter，is（notwithstanding the denial of Origen） testified by nearly all the MSS．，confirmed by general tradition，and the authority of the Fa－ thers，of whom Justin Martyr says that Christ
 should have been taught some handicraft occu－ pation the Jewish Law required，and the poverty of Joseph would render it necessary．And what was so likely or customary as that he should bring him up to his father＇s trade，which，though lowly，was not degrading？See more in Bp． Middleton．

















－ion tripos $\dot{\eta} \mu a ̂ s]$ hic pud nos．Fritz．ob－ serves that both the Scriptural writers and the Classical ones，（at least the poets），so place mos with an Accusative，adjecto verbo quietis that is equivalent to rap $\alpha$ with a Dative．
5．sal oik risúvaro－soiñaas］On the sense of these words there has been no little difference of opinion．The words，in their common accepts－ ton，present a seeming difficulty，to avoid which， some（as Wolf and $K$ un．）suppose a pleonasm，
 （as F ritz．has shown）this pleonasm is comment－ tious，and the passages adduced in support of it admit of a better explanation without it．Others take $\dot{\text { ióùvaro }}$ for noluit．This，however，Fritz． shows is even more destitute of foundation than the former sense．The true interpretation seems to be that of many antient Commentators（as Chrysost．，Euthym．，and Theophyl．）and，of the modern ones，Grot．，Whitby，Lo Clerc，Bentley， and Fritz．＂Our Saviour could not，（says Theophyl．），not because he wanted power，but that the subjects of it were unbelieving and there－ fore（as Whity says）wanted the condition on which alone it was fit he should heal them． Christ could not，consistently with the rules on which he invariably acted in performing miracles， （namely，to require faith in his Divine mission） perform them．The Commentators observe，that it is conformable to the Hebrew manner of speak－ ing to say that that cannot be which shall not，or ought not to be．But abundance of examples of this have been adduced from both the Greek and Latin Classical writers；and the idiom is found even in modern languages．
6．dA aúraऍ̧］Schleusn．，Kun．，and myself in Recens．Synop．，take the word rather of indigna－ sion than uronder ；a signification，indeed，not infrequent in the Classical writers，but perhaps not found in the New Testament．Far simpler and quite satisfactory is the common interpreta－ sion＇he wondered at their want of faith，＇and
perverseness in rejecting his claims on such un－ reasonable grounds．This construction，indeed， of $\theta$ avpáyes is very rare，（the usual one being Өavá\} . ~ e x ~ i ~ $\tau \nu \nu$ ，or $\pi$ rel rivas．）Of the examples adduced by Wets．，Musth and Heupel，the fol－ lowing alone are apposite．Isocr．ш̈テテe sal roves
 and John vi．21．Er đ̈pyov éxoinga，кal mates өаицá乌ете doa тойто．
Kür $\lambda \varphi \rho$ must（as Fritz．says）be joined with
 by the Classical writers often subjoined to verbs compounded with $\pi$ rpt．
7．д́vo dúo ］＇by twoes．＇An idiom found in the Hebrew，in which distributives are wanting．
9．val $\mu \eta$ d duvíracoat 1 This is the reading of the common text，and it is supported by the great body of the MSS．But dעסvivŋ $\sigma \theta e$ is found in some of the best，and in the Syr．；Vulg．，Goth．， and Coptic Versions，as also in the Edition Prince． and Stephens＇first and second；and it has been edited by Mill，Beng．，Math．，Griesb．，and all other Editors down to Scholz，except Fritz．，who has recalled the common reading dvóv́acöat； and，I think，on good grounds．He shows that $z \nu \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta \sigma \theta e$ would involve an unprecedented ana－ coluthon，and an extreme harshness：and，after a long and learned discussion，decidedly prefers eu $\quad \dot{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \sigma \theta a t$ ；by which there will be either an $A n a-$ coluthon，or a variation by means of two con－ structions，the former of which modes，he shows， is preferable．Thus，after $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ，from the words ＂aa undèv alp．els dodo，we must supply lévat，or Baö！̧etv．Fritz．thus renders：＇jussit eos nullà re in imperatam isis siam secum sumptâ pro－ ficisci－sed（ire）sandaliis instructor neque duas
 Td $\pi a \rho \dot{r} \gamma \gamma \boldsymbol{\sigma} \lambda_{\mathrm{A}}$ Euthymius）．This interpretation is also supported by Grot．，Heupel，Camp．，and Kuin ；and，as being alike satisfactory in sense and construction，it deserves the preference．

11．sis $\mu a \rho \tau \dot{j} \rho t o y ~ a \dot{u} \tau o i s]$＂that it may exist
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as a testimony unto them, i. e. as a testimony of their unbelief, and as a declaration that they are unworthy of commerce with you." (Newcome.)
13. $\boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda \in \iota \phi o \nu \dot{\epsilon} \lambda a i c p]$ It appears from various passages of the Medical and Rabbinical writers cited by Wets. and Lightf., that oil (which in the Eastern and Southern countries is of a peculiarly mild quality) was used by the antients, both Jews and Gentiles (and had been so from the earliest ages) as a medical application. And that it was so used by the Apostles, and that the sense is, ' they anointed many with oil and thereby cured their diseases ;' is the opinion of almost all the recent Commentators. But surely this circumstance, that the Apostles had successfully made use of a well-known medicine, would ill comport with the gravity and dignity of the preceding words, which, I think, compel us to suppose, with all the antient and early modern Commentators, that the healing was as much miraculous as the casting out demons. The anointing was only employed as a symbolical action, typical of the oil of gladness to be imparted by Divine assistance. See Euthym. and Theophyl. For the first Christians being accustomed to represent, in visible signs, the allegorical allusions in Scripture, used oil not only as the Jews had done, as a remedy which had become sacred, but, (from that sacredness,) as a religious rite at baptism, confirmation, and prayers for the sick. Or we may, with Fritz., (who fully acknowledges the miraculousness of the cures) regard the anointing with oil (being a frequent mode of imparting relief) as one of those significant actions by which both the Prophets of the Old Testament and the Apostles, (after their Lord's example) with indulgence to human weakness, accompanied their supernatural and miraculous cures. In all which cases, the methods adopted in those actions (which were various) contributed nothing to the cure, that being effected by means of which we can have no conception.
14. ท̈коvбєy d $\beta$ afı $\lambda \epsilon$ ùs] There is here, seemingly, a want of the Subject to the verh. With this the early Critics have, indeed, furnished us, supplying тiv dккoìv roü' Inooü, which Beza approves, and Fritz., with his usual rashness as
an Editor, inserts in the tert. But it is with reason rejected by all other Fditors, as being from the margin. It is certainly better to retain a harshness than to get rid of it by such means. Grot. proposes to put фavepò yàp é $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\text {évero }}$ into a parenthesis. But this would involve a very harsh hyperbaton. The best mode is to supply the subject airdy from the preceding context, ver. 10.; which is suggested in the subsequent rd övoца аúvoū.

- ovoца] ' fame.' So the Latin nomen. \$aveคdv '́ $\gamma$ '́veтo, was become celebrated. 'O $\beta$ aтTifw . Participle for substantive $\dot{\delta}$ ßaxtiorvis. 'Evepyoūau ai oivv. \&̀v aútẹ. Kender, and therefore these mighty works are effected by him.'
 been much discussion on the reading and sense of these words. If the testimony of MSS. and antient Versions can prove any thing, it is certain
 троф., of which the sense can only be, 'he is a prophet resembling one of the prophets,' i. e. of old times. The $\dot{j}$ before wis is of little or no authority, being omitted in almost every MS. of consequence, nearly all the Versions, and also in the Ed. Princ. and Stephens 1. \& 2. And it is cancelled by Beng. Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. The above reading; indeed, involves some harshness; yet the sense of т $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ rроф. is not ill suggested by the Article.
 frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers; but it is here adopted to give greater strength to the asseveration. The dyw also seems to be emphatical.
 caused him to be apprehended.' ' $\mathrm{B} \nu \tau \overline{1}$ фu入aкỵ. The $\tau \bar{\eta}$ is omitted in several MSS. (most of them antient ) and the Ed. Princ., and is cancelled by Beng., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz; but is retained by Fritz. ; and with reason; for the number of MSS. is not such as to warrant its being cancelled, and we can far more easily account for its omission than its insertion. Nay, Fritz. regards it as necessary to the sense; the denoting the public prison.




















19. èveī $\chi \in \nu$ aürū] Not, 'had a quarrel with,' as E. V.; nor, ' resented this,' as Campb. ; nor, as Wakef. and some recent Commentators explain, 'was enraged against him;' but, 'bore a grudge against him.' The expression signifies to harbour (literally, 'have in mind') a grudge or resentment against any one, èvekóтet. Sub. кóXov. The complete phrase occurs in Herodot. i. 118. v. 119. \& viit.27. The elliptical one occurs also in Luke xi. 53. and Genes. xlix. 23. (answering to $\square$ (ve) and Job xvi. 9. and Hesych. devéxei'
 similar idiom in é $\gamma \kappa$ котeĩ.
20. є́фовеiтo tóv 'I.] The term here imports a mixture of awe and reverence. Euvetipes aúróv. There is much difference of opinion as to the sense of the ovv. The Vulg., L. Brug., Hamm., Le Clerc, Wets., Campb., Kuin., Schleusn., Wahl, and most Commentators, take it in the sense, ' preserved him,' i. e. from the malice of Herodias. But there is no authority for this signification. Greatly preferable is that assigned by the Syr., Arabic, Old Italic, and English Versions, adopted by Erasm., Grot., Lamy, Whitby, Wakef., Rosenm., and Fritz.; ' observabat eum,' ' observantià prosecutus est, - magni eum faciebat,' colebat. So Diog. Laert. $\phi$ inous $\sigma u v$ тnpeiv, colere, observare amicos. And Hierocl. cited by Wakef. ouvrnpeì roûs vómous. This signification seems to arise from that of keeping any one in our mind. Kal dкoúaas aùroü,' and when he had heard him,' i. e. his
 (which were suggested by him.)'
21. yevouévys ท่̣ $\mu$ épas cúk.] Here again the Interpreters are divided in opinion; the antient and early modern Commentators rendering it, ' an opportune season,' namely, for working on the mind of Herod and obtaining his order for the
execution of John. But almost all since the time of Glass and Hamm. take it to signify ' a festival day.' The expression, however, as Fritz. proves, can only mean ' a leisure day;' and the former interpretation (which is supported by the use of cúxaípos at xiv.11. and 1 Tim. iv.2. and adopted by Wahl and Fritz.) is preferable.

- тois $\mu$ еүเ $\sigma$ ấoıv] A word only occurring in the later writers, as Joseph. and the Sept.; not derived from the Persian, as almost all Commentators say, but, as Fritz. shows, formed from $\mu$ érıotos, as veã̀ from véos. It denotes the magnates, or great men of a country, by whose counsel and assistance the monarch is aided. Tois Xı $\lambda \iota \alpha \dot{\rho} \rho 0 เ s$, 'the principal military officers.' Tois x pótots. This is by Grot. and Kuin. taken to denote the principal magistrates. But it should rather be understood (with Fritz.) of the principal persons for wealth or consequence of those in a private station. So Joseph. Ant. vii. 9, 8.


23. 氏́ws ijuíoous tîs $\beta$ ar.] Many Commentators supply $\mu$ f́pous. But there is perhaps no ellipse; for $\eta_{\mu \iota \sigma v}$ seems to have been as much a substantive as our a half. The promise involved a sort of hyperbole, and was, as appears from the Classical citations of Wets., a not unusual manner of expression with Kings.
 i.e. $\sigma \pi o u \delta a i \omega s$, promptly, with alacrity. 'E $k a v-$ тท⿱s, for тараитiка, forthwith. The earlier authors generally write $\grave{\epsilon} \xi$ au̇चis, scil. wpas. There will be no occasion for the ellipse of $d \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$, which Kuin. and others suppose, before toùs оркоия, if терілитоs yєvópèvos be rendered, 'although he was very sorry.'

- dंerñat to set her at nought, namely, by refusing her request. This sense is chiefy confined to the later writers, especially the Sept.
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and Joseph．，who use the word either absolutely， or with an Accusative of person，sometimes ac－ companied with els；more rarely with an Accus． of thing．

27．бтeкou入 $\alpha$ тwpa］From the Latin speculator． It denotes one of the body－guards，who were so called because their principal duty，was that of sentinels：for I rather agree with Casaub．，Wets．， and Fritz．，that they are so called from their office speculari，not quasi spiculatores，from spi－ culum；because the former points to their chief business．They had，however，other confidential duties，and among these that of acting as exe－ cutioners．

29．T $\bar{\omega} \mu \nu \eta \mu \in i \varphi 0]$ The $\tau \bar{\varphi}$ is rejected by all the Editors from Matth．to Scholz；and with reason； for it is，as Markl．has shown，liable to objection on the score of propriety，and is found in scarcely any MS．but Cod．D．，being，indeed，introduced， perhaps inadvertently，by Stephens in his 3d
 is＇they entombed it．＇
 －reported the miracles they had wrought and the doctrines they had taught．

31．i $\mu$ eís aúrol］This must be rendered not ＇vos ipsi，＇or＇vos quoque，＇with most Comment－ ators，but（with Erasm．，Schleus．，Kuin．，and Fritz．）＇vos soli，＇on which use of aúrds see Schleus．or Wahl．Lex．${ }^{\top}$ Hoav yap－rod $\lambda o l$ ， literally；＇for the comers and goers were nu－ merous；Huxaloouv，for ioxonayov，had leisure．＇The word is almost confined to the later writers．

33．кal cidov－xpods aüтóv］There are few passages of the N．T．in which a greater diversity of readings exists than the present．Editors and Commentators are alike agreed that it has suf－ fered grievously from transcribers；and the unusual diversity of readings has here（as in many other cases）led them to take interpolation for granted：and to relieve the text，pruning has been employed with considerable effect by the recent Editors．Griesb．edits thus：cal eifov

 Bui for this and most of the alterations that have been made there is little authority．Scarcely less of license is there in the text of Fritz．After all， I see no good authority except for the cancelling of oi $\bar{\delta}$ 人 10 ，which is，indeed，found in scarcely any good MS．，and has no place in the Edit．Princ． and the other early Editions，except the later oner of Erasm．，from which it was introduced into Steph．3．Consequently，it has been rejected by Mill and Wets．，and cancelled by Matth．，Griesb．． Vat．，Tittm．，Fritz．，and Scholz．Thus rod入ol becomes the subject of the verbe cioon and $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{c} \gamma-$ yゅo av．To this，however，there is great objection． It is frigid as regards eioov，and as concerns ix í $\gamma \mathrm{y}$ ，inapposite，for，as Campb．remarks，＂the historian［why not the Evangelist ？］would not be likely to say that many knew him，since，after being so long occupied in teaching and healing them，there would be comparatively few who did not know him．＂I cannot，therefore，but suspect （though it seems not to have occurred to any of the Editors and Commentators）that the mo入入ol， though the authorities for its omission are but slender，should not be here．Yet it does not，I suspect，stand here for nothing；but，as it is scarcely possible for us to dispense with a subject． and as the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke both have oi $\delta x^{\lambda o o}$ ，I have no doubt but that under this suspicious rod $n$ ol is concealed that reading，which 1 have therefore ventured to introduce，in smaller character．In this I am supported not only by Critical probability，（for the words sod 101 and $\delta>\lambda$ oc are frequentry con－ founded）but by the authority of the other Evan－ gelists，and indeed of all those numerous MSS． which contain oi oxdol，since they may be con－ sidered as authority for the reading in question， there being little doubt but that in their Arche－ types the reading oi ${ }^{\circ} \times \lambda$ ot was written in the margin，and intended as a correction of the textual rodAol．I have left the received readings through－ out the rest of the verse，because no tolerablecase
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 cis тò̀ oú $\rho a \nu o ̀ \nu, ~ \epsilon u ́ \lambda o ́ \gamma \eta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon^{\circ}$ каi катє́к入абє тоùs äpтоиs，каl
of interpolation or of corruption has been esta－ blished．The clause cal xpoñ $1 \theta$ on aùtoùs is cancelled by Griesb．and Fritz．；but on very slender authority．The objection on the score of false construction，as if $a \dot{u} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ were required，is frivolous；for the very same construction is found in almost every good MS．in Luke xxii．47．，and is rightly edited by Math．，Griesb．，and Scholz． Besides，the circumstance is surely so natural that internal evidence is greatly in its favour． One may easily imagine how the people who saw our Lord and the Apostles，（no doubt，on board ship；which removes Campbell＇s objection） might be circumstanced in respect of them，so as to be enabled to get before them to the place whither they were bound．They would easily see，by the course in which the vessel was di－ recited，the spot where it was meant to land．As to $\eta \lambda \theta o v$ ，edited by Griesb．and Fritz．for $\sigma v \nu \bar{\eta} \lambda$－ Gov，it has scarcely the support of a single MS．， and is，no doubt，a mere correction．The com－ mon reading must be preferred，as being the more difficult．It has a signification pragnans；and the mos with the Accusative is equivalent to a Dative，which latter construction is found in xiv．53．and Luke xxiii．ミvé́pxerөat is often used in this sense in the N．T．
The ìкeĩ denotes els $\tau \delta \nu$ emp $\rho \eta{ }^{2}$ signifies not on foot，but by land，which sense occurs elsewhere in the N．T．
35． $\boldsymbol{\eta} \delta \bar{\eta} \omega_{\rho a s} \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ rev．］Almost all Com－ mentators take the sense to be，＇it was now late in the day．＇Yet they adduce no better proof than examples of the Latin phrase in multam noctem，or diem．Unless，therefore，this be a Latinism，we may explain the phrase with Fritz．， ＇when much of the day was now past．＇But would not that require òtarevopévps？The two interpretations，however，merge into each other， and the signification is chiefly determined by the context and added particles．
36．ксо́ $\mu \mathrm{s}$ ］＇hamlets，or small clusters of houses＇s scattered up and down the country．See Schleus．Lex．Kúк $\kappa \wedge$ ．This use of кúкえц̣ for an
adjective（circumjacentes）is found in the best writers．
 emphatical．
－$\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \lambda$ Oóvтes－фayeiv］The best Comment－ ators antient and modern（See Euthym．，Beza， and Grot．）are of opinion that this sentence con－ tais an interrogation implying admiration，and perhaps indignation．It may be rendered ：＇What must we go and buy，\＆c．？＇At in $\eta=a \rho i \neq \nu$ sub．di di． No ellipse，however，is absolutely necessary． There is reason to think that the sum in question was a proverbial one for a sum of money exceed－ ing the inconsiderable，as we say a good round sum．
38． $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$ óv es ］＇having ascertained．＇
 in a distributive sense；an idiom common in Hebrew．See Note supra vier．7．इvunóotov signifies properly a drinking together，or a com－ mon entertainment；and then，by a metonymy common in our own language，it designates the
 Wets．say that $\chi$ 入 oo $\rho \bar{\varphi}$ is added because $\chi^{\prime} \rho \tau$ properly signifies hay．It rather，however，also means fodder，and though in the Classical writers it almost always denotes dry fodder；yet in the $\mathbf{N}$ ．T．it as constantly signifies herbage of any kind，both of grass and corn．
 pertly signifies a plot of ground，such as in gardens are employed for the growth of vegetables．It is strange that the latest Commentators should adopt the derivation of Hesych．from $\pi \dot{\epsilon}$ pas，quasi portal，when the Etym．Mag．and Zonaras＇ Lex．offer so much better a one，namely from т $\quad$ ácoy，an old word signifying a leek or onion． Thus the term denotes properly an onion－bed，and then any plot of ground of a similar form，a square or parallelogram．See my Note on Thucyd．in． 56. It here denotes regular and equal companies，like squadrons of troops．From Luke we find that each was composed of 50 persons．This method was，no doubt，adopted，to let the multitude know their own number．
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 （i．e．the multitude）farewell．＇The phrase dro－ Távosod $\alpha^{\prime} \iota \tau \iota \nu \iota$ ，in this sense，is（as Fritz．ob－ serves ）not Attic Greek，but that of Philo，Joseph．， and the later writers，especially the N．T．ones．
 is sometimes supplied，but at other times кс́т $\eta \nu$ is used．Baбaviక̧aćvous，laborantes，distressed， hard pressed．＂HӨe入є таре入өєì aúтoús．The laboured Annotations of Grot．，Fritz．，and others here are little to the purpose；and much trouble might have been spared by considering the phrase as a popular one for，＇he would（i．e．he was about to）pass by them；＇or，＇he made as though he would have passed by them．＇So of Jesus it is said，Luke xxiv．28．Kal aútds тробeтoteito то $\rho \dot{\rho} \omega \tau \notin \rho \omega$ торє́́єoөal．
 ajprots is meant，as Krebs observes，тẹ $\theta$ aúmart tois dprots $\gamma \in \nu o \mu$ éve．That Commentator， however，and Kuin．，with some other recent Interpreters，seem wrong in assigning to $d \pi l$ the sense post．I myself still continue of the same opinion as in Recens．Synop．that the true one is per，by，denoting the efficient cause；as in Matth．iv．4．And this is supported by Fritz．in his Note，who renders：＇Non enim per priores portenti opportunitatem quidquam intellexerant， sed erant callo obducta mente．＇

signifies to bring a ship reds $\delta \rho \mu o \nu$ ，to a port，or sometimes a station or place fit for landing or drawing a ship ashore．The latter sense is here to be adopted．

54．દ̇tүvóvtes aùtì ］Some MSS．and Ver－ sions have added oi duoj es toû тózov èceívov， words，no doubt，derived from Matt．xiv．13．It may seem harsh that the subject of the verb should be suppressed；to soften which，Fritz．would take the words $d \pi \imath \gamma \nu o \nu \tau e s-\eta \eta^{\prime} \rho \xi a \nu \tau o$ as put imper－ sonally．But it will be more satisfactory to suppose an ellipsis of the subject，namely，the common one，corresponding to the man of the Germans and our men，which will here denote the inhabitants of that country．This obscurity is perhaps meant to be somewhat cleared up by the txeluyv following，which is equivalent to éxeíyov tótov．
55．тepıбрано́yтєs］having run about，dis－ currentes．Erl тois краß阝áтoıs，upon their couches．＇Art．for possess．pron．For тepıф́ं－
 and others，again，пробф́́pєıv，which Fritz．edits； but wrongly；for the varr．lectt．arose from the librarii stumbling at the use of zєрьфє́рєьv here， which has a significatio prægnans，including the senses expressed by the above various readings； q．d．＇they carried them about（i．e．up and down） and brought them to those places where they heard he was．＇










－örov］This must not be taken for quoniam， （with Palairet and Schleusn．），but rather（with Beza，Grot．，Wets．，Kuin．，and Winer）the words $\ddot{\ddot{2}} \pi$ ou－ix $\bar{i}$ must be closely connected， corresponding to the Heb．אישר־שם，in the sense $u b i$ ．Thus the $\dot{d \kappa e i}$ is said to be redundant． Fritz．，however，makes well－founded objections to this combination of the words，and supposing the redundancy of them；because the words $\tilde{o}$ Tı $\dot{\text { éceí } \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \iota}$ are an independent clause．And he，very properly，limits the above mentioned idiom to passages where the words occur in the same clause．He would therefore render éatt adest．But it may be better to regard the sen－ tence as an abbreviation of the more enlarged expression of primitive times，when it would have been phrased＂carried them to the place， of which they had heard it said，＂he is there．＂ Compare 1 Kings xviii．10．Thus $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa e \bar{i}$ is least of all pleonastic．

56．тapeкá入ouv aùrd̀」 It is not clear whe－ ther this is to be understood of those who laid the sick persons down，or of the sick persons themselves．The former method is more suited to the construction；but the latter（which is adopted by Abp．Newcome）is more agreeable to probability．Käv，vel，even，but．
－$\quad$ oroı $\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\nu} \dot{\eta} \pi \tau$ ．］The $\tilde{\alpha} \nu$ is not without force， denoting，as Winer thinks，（Gr．N．T．p．117．）the uncertainty of the number．I would render， ＇as many as might have touched．＇
VII．1．סvyàovтat］＂convenerunt．＂＇Eス $\theta$ ． $\alpha \pi \dot{o}$＇I．These are supposed to have been emis－ saries from the Sanhedrim；but we cannot safely infer their motives and purpose．
2．кo九yais $\}$ It was quite in the Jewish idiom to oppose common and holy，the most usual sig－ nification of the latter word in the Old Testa－ ment being separated from common，and devoted to sacred use．Their meals were（as the apostle expressed it， 1 Tim．iv．5．）sanctifed by the word of God and prayer．They were，therefore，not to be touched with unhallowed hands．The superficial Pharisee，who was uniform（wherever religion was concerned）in attending to the latter， not to the spirit of the rule，understood this as implying solely that they must wash their hands before they eat．（Campb．）Kocvos here（as often in Joseph．）signifies what is ritually im－ pure：thus，as regarded the hands，it denoted that they were not washed ritually，i．e．just before the meal，though they might otherwise be clean．
－iцi $\mu \psi$（ MSS，and some Versions，is rejected by Mill
and Beng．，and is cancelled by Griesb．，Tittm．， and Scholz，but retained and ably defended by Fritz．He proves that it cannot be a gloss，and accounts for its expulsion on the ground，that the term was thought disrespectful to our Sa － viour．But it is better to suppose that the omission in those comparatively very few MSS． arose from a previous corruption，（ 1 suspect， into $\boldsymbol{\epsilon \pi}$ én $\psi$ avto ；for the words are often con－ founded），which introduced what was unintel－ ligible，and therefore was expelled from the text， especially as，by including vv． $3 \& 4$ ．in a paren－ thesis，the word was unnecessary．
3．тávres］i．e．all those who observed the traditions；for the Sadducees and a few others （comparatively a small part of the nation）re－ jected this custom．
－$\pi v y \mu \hat{\eta}]$ There are few expressions on which the Commentators are more divided in opinion than this．The early Versions show that the antients were as much perplexed with it as the moderns．The Vulg．and some other Versions give the sense sape；whence it has been supposed，that they read ruки $\bar{\eta}$ ，which might be taken for ruкva，and that for $\pi v \kappa \nu \omega \bar{s}$ ． But（as Fritz．observes）there is no proof of the existence of any such adverb as $\pi v \kappa \nu \tilde{y}$ ；and the sense scepe would be inapposite．To turn to the interpretations of those who retain the common reading，several Commentators，antient and mo－ dern，take $\pi v \gamma \mu \bar{\eta}$ to mean＇up to the elbow．＇ But though $\pi v \gamma \mu \dot{\eta}$ might be proved to have the signification ellow，yet such a one as＇up to＇in the Dative cannot be tolerated．For the same reason，the interpretation of Lightf．，Hamm．， Schoetg．，and Heupel＇up to the wrist，＇must be rejected．Others，as Wets．，Pearce，Campb．， and Rosenm．，endeavour to remove the difficulty by taking $\pi v \gamma \mu \bar{\eta}$ to mean＇a handful of water，＇ such as the contracted palm will contain，or rather a guartarius，the smallest measure allowed for washing the hands．And this mode of inter－ pretation Campb．has supported very ingeniously， but not convincingly；for（as Fritz．observes） that sense would require $\pi v \gamma \mu \bar{\eta}$ u $\delta a r o s . \mathrm{Be}$－ sides，it may be added，$\pi v \gamma \mu \bar{p}$ can only mean the contracted hand，the doubled fist，in which sense the word is here taken by Scalig．Beza． Grot．，and Fritz．；who，however，are not agreed on the manner of the action．The most probable view is that of Beza and Fritz．，who render ＇unless they have washed their hands with the fist；＇which explanation is confirmed by the customs of the Jews，as preserved in the Rab－ binical writers，and even yet in use．Thus the
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 （i．e．the multitude）farewell．＇The phrase $\alpha$ тo－ rárocoөd́ rıvı，in this sense，is（as Fritz．ob－ serves ）not Attic Greek，but that of Philo，Joseph．， and the later writers，especially the N．T．ones．

48．＇̇v $\tau \underset{̣}{0}$ è $\lambda a u ́ v \in \iota \nu]$ scil．Triv vaûv．The ellipsis is sometimes supplied，but at other times кшín $\nu$ is used．Baбavi̧̧oúvous，laborantes，distressed， hard pressed．＂H $\theta \in \lambda \in \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \lambda \theta \in i \nu$ a⿱亠乂寸тoús．The laboured Annotations of Grot．，Fritz．，and others here are little to the purpose；and much trouble might have been spared by considering the phrase as a popular one for，＇he would（i．e．he was about to ）pass by them；＇or，＇he made as though he would have passed by them．＇So of Jesus it is said，Luke xxiv．28．Kal aútds тробетоьеіто тор́คюте́рс торєи́ебөає．
 äprors is meant，as Krebs observes，Tẹ $\theta$ aú $\mu a \tau$ тois «́ptos $\gamma \in \nu \neq \mu$ ćvẹ．That Commentator， however，and Kuin．，with some other recent Interpreters，seem wrong in assigning to $t \pi l$ the sense post．I myself still continue of the same opinion as in Recens．Synop，that the true one is per，by，denoting the efficient cause；as in Matth．iv．4．And this is supporterl by Fritz．in his Note，who renders：＇Non enim per priores portenti opportunitatem quidquam intell
sed erant callo obductâ mente．
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rendering of the Syr．diligenter may be admitted as a free translation，as also those of studiosé，or sedulò，adopted by some moderns：indeed，（as Leigh says）almost all the interpretations imply diligent care in washing．
－кратоїитes］＇carefully，pertinaciously ad－ haring top，and observing．＇Such is the full sense of the word，which is so used in 2 Thess．ii． 15.
 of which ellipse the Commentators adduce many examples，as also of the complete phrase．＇Eam $\mu \eta$＇$\beta a \pi \tau$ ．This is best explained，＇unless they wash their bodies，＇（in opposition to the washing of the hards before mentioned），in which，how－ ever，is not implied immersion，which was never used but when some actual，and not possible．
 coareiv．Render＇$w$ mich they have received from， their ancestors，that they may firmly keep them．＇
 holding a pint and a half．The word is frequent in the later writers，and is，indeed，of Latin origin．Xa入xicov，copper or brazen vessels． Earthen vessels are not mentioned，because those were broken，if supposed to be polluted．
 sofas．
9．ка入लis dieereite］The best Commentators （as Euthym．，Berra，Casaub．，Glass，Cameron， Heupel，Camp．，Rosenm．，＇Kuin．，Schleusn．，

Fritz．，and Scott）are agreed that this is to be taken as an ironical reproof．Thus the кa入 $\overline{\text { os }}$ corresponds to our finely，cleverly；a use fere－ quest in the Classical writers．Some Commen－ taters，who are averse to imputing irony to our Lord，devise other modes of interpretation，all of them either open to strong objections，or closely bordering on irony．
 wanting in this sentence，to supply which，Risc．， Beza，and Casaub．understand insons crit．But it is better to resort to that idiom by which the Greeks leave in a sentence some verb of a con－ trary signification to be repeated from the pres－ ceding sentence ：and thus，with Krebs，Kin．， and fritz．，we may here repeat $\mu \eta$＇$\theta a \nu \alpha \dot{\sigma} c$ тeोevтáco，＇he shall wot suffer the punishment denounced．＇
12．каl оùке́тı $\dot{\alpha} \phi$ ieee，\＆c．］The sense is， ＇and by thus abrogating the Divine precept，ye permit him not any longer to，＇\＆cc．，namely，out of the money so consecrated，because the devo－ zion of it was made with an imprecation against the devotee，if he employed the morrey to any other purpose．The phrase ouse roceiv is a popular one，signifying to benefit any one，the Tull being a Datives commodi．

13．$\hat{\eta}$ raped．］This is not，as some imagine， pleonastic，but signifies＇que propagate soletis，＇ as Fritz．renders．The $\bar{j}$ is，by attraction，for















 $\gamma \epsilon \iota a, \dot{o} \phi \theta a \lambda \mu$ òs $\pi о \nu \eta \rho o ̀ s, ~ \beta \lambda \alpha \sigma \phi \eta \mu i a, ~ \dot{~} \pi \epsilon \rho \eta \phi а \nu i ́ a, \dot{a} \phi \rho o-$
 subterfuge just mentioned.
18. oüтш кal $\dot{\nu} \mu e i \bar{s}]$ ' are even ye,' \&c.
19. каӨарi̧ov та́vта тà $\beta$.] ln this passage there is much variety of reading and diversity of interpretation. The vars. lect., however, are, as Fritz. has shown, of such a nature as to afford no reason to call in question the common reading, they being either slips of the pen, or glosses. And the conjectures of Critics are entitled to no attention, unless it can be shown that the common reading is incapable of any tolerable explanaion; which is not the case. For although most of the many modes of interpretation adopted are quite inadmissible, and some even ludicrously absurd, yet a tolerably good sense may be extracted from the words. Such, I conceive, is that which I have, with some hesitation, propounded in Recons. Synop., where kalápifov is taken as a Nominative absolute, and rendered 'purifying by removal.' This I find supported by the authority of Fritz., who, after an elaborate discussion of the sense, adopts that view. Of course, the Participle with $\ddot{\circ}$ and $\chi$ рй a understood must be considered as standing for $\ddot{0}$ and a verb in the Indicative, i.e. on ка日api̧et; q. d. - which circumstance ( namely, that the meats are cast into the jakes) makes them all alike pure.' This use of the Participle, which often takes
 more than once illustrated in Thucyd. See Herm. Opusc. Vol. 1. p. 203.
21. eccooev $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho$, \&c.] The things here mentoned as defiling the man, are either I. sins committed against the 2 d table of the Law, as murder and an evil eye, against the fth commandment; fornication, adultery, and lasciviousness, against the 7th; theft and deceit, against the 8th; false witness and blasphemy, against the 9 th; and covetousness, against the 10 th. Or 11 . the evil dispositions which incline us to those
 дıалоуıбноl какоi. (Whity.)
On these terms (which are only to be considered as exemplifying the vices which defile, not enumerating them all) Commentators are not agreed. I have long thought that they ought to be distributed into three classes. 1. भoıхeĩat,

 poovivy. This view is supported by the opinion of Fritz.; who regards the lIst class as that of vices occasioning injury in action; the 2 d as consisting of vices which arise from evil dispositions ; the Jd of those which consist in vices of speech. A classification, however, as will appear from what follows, defective.
$W$ isth respect to the terms themselves, by $\pi \lambda e o v \in \xi i a t$ are denoted inordinate desires, and the overreachings which they produce. Hovnpiat may be rendered malitia, being coupled with dólos, as $\pi \lambda \in o \nu \in \xi i a t$ is with $\kappa \lambda о \pi a i$. 'A $\sigma$ er $\gamma \in \iota a$ does not signify insolentia, as Ruin. explains, but lascivia. With this is well coupled lust of another kind, namely, that of envy, a sense of $\dot{\sigma} \phi \theta a \lambda \mu \partial s$ тoumpds on which the best Commentaters are agreed. Bגaбф $\eta \mu i \alpha$ signifies calumny and false witness of every kind. Yтєрทфаvia, haughtiness, contempt of others. 'Aфpooív ${ }^{\prime}$, from its extent of signification, and seeming indefiniteness, has been variously interpreted. Grot. explains it incogitantiam rerum bonarum ; Kain., 'perditam nequitiam ;' Fritz., temeritafem in loquendo. The two first interpretations are equally wide of the mark, though at the extremes. The third may be admitted. But I am still inclined to retain the interpretsion adopted (from Doddr.) in Recens. Synop., namely folly, as opposed to $\sigma \infty \phi \rho o \sigma \dot{v} \eta$, a levity of demeanour, as opposed to seriousness. and so well described by Milton in his Il Pence. rosa.




















#### Abstract

24. тג̀ $\mu$ efópıa T. кal $\Sigma$.] This is by Beza and most Commentators taken to mean, that country which divided Palestine from Tyre and Sidon. But Fritz. thinks it is meant that our Lord had entered into the territory of Tyre and Sidon. In fact, the district in question was a strip of land antiently debateable border land, (like the Thyreatis between Argolis and Laconia, and some other tracts in Greece), but afterwards ceded by Solomon to the King of Tyre, though it long afterwards retained its original name of the border land.


- $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ ] This is omitted in very many MSS., most of them antient, and almost all the early Edd., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Bengel to Scholz. The Article can (as Middlet. says) have no place here. At $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\boldsymbol{y}} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { c }} \mathrm{\nu at}$ Sub. aüróv. It seems to be a popular form of expression. Kal oúc rid. The cal signifies but.

26. 'E ${ }^{\text {A }} \lambda_{\eta \nu i r] ~ a ~ G e n t i l e, ~ o r ~ p a g a n, ~(c a l l e d ~ i n-~}^{\text {- }}$ Matthew Kavavaia) for the distinction is one not of country, but religion. The Heathens had for a long time been called by the name of Greeks, because many of those with whom the Jews had commerce were either such, or at least used the Grecian language. Supoфoivicaa. A woman of the country called Syria Phœenicia, which lay between Syria and Phoenicia. $\Sigma$ vpo $\phi$. is said because there were $\Lambda \iota \beta$ vфóıvıкes, i. e. Carthaginians. Many MSS. here have Evpo-中oıviкı $\sigma \sigma a$, which is received by Matth., Griesb., Vat.: Tittm., and Scholz. But the common reading is retained and ably defended by Fritz.

- ${ }^{\kappa} \kappa \beta a \lambda y$ ] This (for the common reading $\left.i^{i} \kappa \beta^{\prime} \lambda \lambda y\right)$, found in very many of the best MSS. and the Ed. Princ., was preferred by Mill and
adopted by Wets., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. It is (Fritz. truly remarks) required by the correspondence of tenses found in the Greek idiom.

27. áфеs трйтoy-кvעapioss] q. d. •do not ask me before the time to confer benefits upon you, nor act like those who would be fed before the children are satiated.' Such is the sense assigned by Fritz., who regards these two clauses as containing two proverbial forms. Thus (he thinks) is removed what might seem somewhat of inhumanity in our Lord's casting at the miserable petitioner a Jewish term of insult.
28. עal ки́pıt $]$ Sub. ка入óv é $\sigma \tau \iota, \& c$. 'True, Lord, it is right, \&c. Kal yáp, 'for even.'
29. Üxaye] This does not import begone, but implies a granting of the request, q.d. 'go in God's name.' $\Delta \iota a$ roütov тóv $\lambda$ óyov, 'because of this speech (so full of humility and faith).'
30. $\beta \sigma \beta \lambda \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta \nu \dot{d} \pi l \tau \bar{s} \delta \kappa \lambda$.] i. e. lying tranquil and composed, not, as before, running up and down, or lying on the ground.
31. кco $\phi \dot{d \nu} \mu_{0} \gamma_{\Delta} \lambda^{\alpha} \lambda_{0} \nu$ ] There is some difference of opinion on the sense of these words. Some antient Translators and early modern Commentators, take $\mu 0 \gamma_{\Delta} \lambda^{\prime} \lambda o \nu$ to denote one dumb; which they seek to establish by the use of the word in the Sept. at Is. xxxv. 5. But that version is erroneous, and therefore cannot afford any proof. In vain, too, do they appeal to Matth. ix. 33. and Luke xi. 14., for there is every reason to suppose this miracle a different one from that there recorded. Besides, the words used of the man after his cure, $d \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \lambda$ ec $\delta \rho \theta$ oös, concur with the proper signification of the term, (namely, one who speaks uith difficulty) to show that the
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person was not dumb by nature, nor, probably, deaf by nature, otherwise it would have been needless to call him dumb; (for such persons always are so) but was one who having early lost his hearing, gradually lost much of his speech, and became a stammerer. Such an mmpediment is either natural, arising from what is called a boss, or ulcer, by which any one is, as we say, tongue-tied, (of which Wets. adduces some examples from the Classical writers, and I have myself, in Recens. Synop., added others still more apposite, from Artemid. and Philostratus), or acquired, when, from an early loss of hearing, the membrane of the tongue becomes rigid and unable to perform its office. That the former was the case of this poor sufferer, may seem proved by the expression at ver. 35. d $\lambda \dot{c} \dot{\theta} \eta \boldsymbol{j} \dot{\delta}$ deopeds Tiv $\gamma \lambda c \dot{\sigma} \sigma \boldsymbol{\eta}$ s. But even that may be taken figuratively, (as in some of the passages cited by Wets.), and the latter (which is the view taken by Fritz.) is probably the true one. This sense of $\mu$ ovid $\lambda$ os is adopted by the Syriac Translator, and also by Beza, Grot., and almost all of the recent Commentators, who answer the argument of their opponents, that at ver. 37. we have cal sous cia ${ }^{\text {caus } \lambda a \lambda \epsilon i v, ~ b y ~ o b s e r v i n g ~}$ that that is either a general expression, and not limited to this sense, or that $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \lambda o s$ is used by a common hyperbole.
 and apart from the multitude,' not, away from them, or out of their sight. This was probably done for the same reason as that which influenced our Lord in the miracle recorded supra v. 40.

- Bale-тá io va aúroū] Since this and the other action mentioned could contribute nothing to the care, though we find such used on other occasions, as viii. 23. and Joh. ix. 6, (nay, the very putting his hands on the sick can be viewed in no other light), it has been asked why our Lond used them. Such inquiries are often rash, and we are not bound in all cases to give a reason (since our Saviour's adoption of an action shows its fitness) ; yet here we can be at no loss. The reason was, no doubt, that assigned by Grot.
and Whitey, and adopted by most recent Commentators, as Kuin. and Fritz., namely, that Christ was pleased, in condescension to human weakness, to use external actions significant of the cure to be performed, and thereby to strengthen the faith and confirm the hopes of the sick persons and those who brought them; and moreover to show that the power he was about to exert resided in himself. Our Lord adopted these actions, and the usual one of laying his hands on the sick, (as he was alone desired to do), to show that he was not confined to any one particular mode.
- x דú as] 'having spit,' i.e. either on the ground, or in one of his hands.

34. '்̇т with human calamity. Compare Hebr. iv. 15. 'Еффaөd. Syro Chaldee, and the Imperative of the passive conjugation Ethpael. $\Delta \iota a \nu o i x \theta \eta \tau \iota$, i. e. have the use of thine ears. Aúeg 0 at would seem a more proper term as applied to the tongue; but dravoireofat is adopted as being applicable to the removal of both obstructions. For in Hebrew phraseology to open any one's eyes or ears denotes imparting to him the faculty of sight and of speech. Grot. observes that such words are used to be interchanged, "per abusooner." In which last opinion I cannot agree with him. The reason rather is, that in words indicative of the deprivation of any natural faculty there is one common idea. Thus our words dumb, blind, and deaf are all derived from past participles of verbs signifying to stop up. And the same might be shown in almost all the correspondent words of other languages.
35. ©̈бoy] for $\kappa a \theta^{\prime}$ '̈ gov, say most Commentaters, who also at $\mu \bar{a} \lambda \lambda_{\text {on }}$ supply togoúт $\varphi$. But Fritz., with reason, rejects both ellipses, and simply renders the words quantum-and magis. There is not (as some suppose) any pleonasm in $\mu \bar{a} \lambda \lambda$ on $\pi \in \rho . ;$ but, as Fritz. observes, the $\mu \bar{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ adds weight and intensity to the following comparative тepıōóтepov. He compares Aristoph. Eccl. 1131. $\mu \bar{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o y ~ \delta \lambda \beta \iota \omega ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o s . ~$ and refers to Whiner's Gr. Gr. p. ET. See (instar отпіия) Негm. Opusc. i. 222.
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VIII. 2. í $\mu$ épat] This (for the common reading $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{c} \rho a \mathrm{~s}$ ) is found in very many MSS., most of them antient, and is preferred by Mill, Beng., and Wets., and edited by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz. See Note on Matt. xv. 32 .
36. víotesc] 'fasting;' from virates. For \#̈кovat some would read, from several MSS., ท̈кaбt. But Fritz. shows that the use of the preterite $\dot{\eta}^{\kappa} \alpha$, however it may be found in the Sept., Joseph., and Liban., cannot be proved to have been adopted by the writers of the N.T. Besides, there is no need of the change, since the Present of ${ }^{n} \kappa c \infty$ has often the sense of the Preterite. Thus we may render 'are come,' or 'had come.'
37. $\mu e ́ \rho \eta]$ ' region,' 'öpıa, as some MSS. read, by gloss. This use is only found in the later Greek writers, including the LXX.
 with him. The word properly signifies 'to use mutual inquiry and discussion. The construction of this verse (which is somewhat rough) is thus adjusted by Fritz. "Y Y
 but rocpayoures aürdy to the whole sentence
 der mecpá̧ovtes aùTdy ('thereby) tempting him.'
 sive, and signifies what is deep (for the notions of height and depth concur.) i.e. ' having fetched a deep groan, or sigh from the very heart.'

- $\epsilon$ l $\delta 0 \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \tau a t, \& c$.] The $\epsilon l$ is not (as some imagine) put for ovं; but, as the best Commentators are agreed, this is a form of solemn asseveration, common in the O. T., but rarely, if ever, found in the Classical writers), in which there is implied an imprecation; which, however, is omitted per aposiopesin et gravitatis ergo. The nature of the imprecation (" may I not live!" or the like) will depend upon the subject and the speaker. This is supplied at Ezek. xiv. 16. Sept. The Classical writers use the complete form, but only, I think, with el $\mu \eta$.

15. $\beta \lambda \dot{d}^{2} \pi \epsilon \tau \epsilon d \pi \delta$ ] Equivalent to the $\pi p o \sigma-$ éxere of Matthew and the $\phi u \lambda \dot{\alpha} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ of Luke.
 Matthew joins the Sadducees with the Pharisees, and makes no mention of Herod. But there is no real discrepancy, since Herod and the Herodians (i.e. his adherents and courtiers) were, no doubt, Sadducees, and there is every reason to think that their doctrines and morals were such as to justify the caution of our Lord. Z Zo $\mu \eta$, by a striking metaphor, denotes the infaction of false doctrines, (as Matt. xvi. 12.), as well as of corrupt morale.






















16. тévтe áptovs ék $\lambda a \sigma \alpha$ els toùs $\pi$.] It is well observed by Fritz. that there is here a prognuns construction, in which is included the two senses to break the loaves, and to distribute them to the multitude. This use is indeed frequent both in the Scriptural and Classical writers.
22-26. This miracle is recorded only by Mark, though it has several circumstances which render it worthy of particular attention.
 mentators say, because he thought those who had seen so many miracles in vain, were not worthy to see more. The reason, however, seems rather to have been, that our Lord never chose to perform a miracle with a crowd pressing about him. See supra iii. $10.8 c$ v. 28.

- xtưoas els тà on $\mu \mu a \tau \alpha]$ Our Lord was here again pleased to vary the mode of the external action; and that the one adopted on this occasion was not unusual with those who pretended to cure blindness, or dimness of sight, we may suppose from the same thing occurring in an account of a pretended miracle narrated in Sutton. Vespas. 7. Our Lord was also pleased to vary the operation, and cause that it should not be instantaneous, but gradual.
 only to look up, but 'to recover the sight,' which latter signification many Commentators (after Erasm.) here adopt. That however, (as Camp. observes) only has place where a complete recovers is denoted, which was not the case here, the perfection of it being marked by the words

$\tau a s$. The best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed on the former signification to look up. He looked up to ascertain whether he had recovered his sight.
 These words have occasioned somewhat of perplexity. There is too great a variety of readings ; for several MSS., some of them antient and early
 ठévò $\rho \alpha$ jo $\rho \bar{\omega}$. $\pi \in \rho \iota \pi$. And this was edited by Schmid, Mill, Beng., and Math. But Fritz. has shown that this reading, whichever way it be turned, yields no tolerable sense; and he (in common with Griesb., Titter., Vat., and Scholz) edits the words without the $\%$ ot and cos, as in the textus receptus. This, too, is found in the Edit. Pr. and the great body of MSS., confirmed by almost every one of the antient Versions; and it is doubtless to be preferred. The other doubtless arose, as Fritz. remarks, e dirtoypadía, i. e.

 $\pi \in \rho i \pi$.; and the sense is, 'I see men, as trees, walking,' i. e. I can distinguish men from trees only by their walking; a result of imperfect vision; since a confusion of vision in the objects is, as Plato observes, the first sign of returning sight, which, as he says, tins al on $\dot{\eta} \sigma e$ cos $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̈ \alpha$ тарад入่́ттel. This view of the sense is confirmed by Victor, who, no doubt, derived it from the Fathers. From the above it is plain that the person was not born blind, but had lost his sight. from disease.

n Matt. 16. 13. Luc. 9.18.
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 which the antients used to raise the nap of worn cloth. This was one of the offices of an artisan called yvapeús, and with it were united that of cleansing soiled garments, and restoring them to their original state, either by dying them, or, by the use of fuller's earth and alkali, restoring their whiteness.
 with the Dative is rare; (that with the Accusative being the usual one), but it is found also in Acts v. 15. and Ps. xc. 3. Sept., and $\dot{\text { entraciáseıv } \tau \iota \nu l}$ may there be rendered 'to be a shade to,' or over 'any one;' the Dative (which is not, as Fritz. imagines, a Dativus commodi) being suspended on the exat.

- $\lambda \dot{f}$ 'ovara] This is omitted in many MSS., most of them antient, some Versions, and Theophyl.; and it is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., and Fritz., as having been introduced from the other Gospels. Auvoù dкоvere, 'Him bear ye.'
 taken adverbially of the old epic adjective
 by the Attics to d $\xi$ al $\phi \nu \eta$ y. Yet the old adverb was again introduced into the language probably by the Macedonians, and occurs sometimes in the later writers, and is frequent in the LXX. 'A $1 \lambda \alpha^{2} \tau \delta \nu$ 'I. This is generally taken as put for el $\mu$ rí. That principle, however, is not neces- $^{\text {a }}$ sary, if, with Fritz., we suppose the $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ as put with reference to the negative in oukért, and supply a verb of seeing from the preceding participle.
 been no little difference of opinion as to the sense of these words, which will, indeed, much depend upon the construction. Some construe them with the words following, w $\rho \dot{d}$ s eaurovs; others take them with ouYnroüvtes. The former method is preferred by some of the antient and
the earlier modern Commentators; but the latter is adopted by almost all from the time of Heuman and Schulz. ; and with reason ; for such a construction as the former would be unprecedented. They are, however, not agreed on the sense of expaitnoay; some rendering it ' reticuerunt,' others 'animo exceperunt;', others, 'animo retinuerunt.' To all of these interpretations, however, objections are made by Fritz., who renders 'sermonem (Jesu) firmiter tenuerunt.' This last perhaps deserves the preference; but the reticuerunt of Schleus. and others is not objection-
 rediri, ' what Jesus meant by speaking of rising from the dead. They did not question the general resurrection, which all but the Sadducees believed, but they could not reconcile this language with what they had learnt in the Law, that Christ should live for ever and hold an everlasting kingdom. Hence their slowness in comprehending what Christ often afterwards repeated to them, of his death and resurrection. Insomuch that when Christ was dead, their hopes died with him, and only revived at his resurrection.
 take the ötc in the sense why. Fritz., however, rejects this interpretation; and indeed that sig: nification is almost exploded in the Classical writers. He would read $\tau i$ oivy, with some Latin Versions. But this is of slender authority, and the oüy was doubtless derived from Matth. xvii. 10. If the common reading be correct, the best mode of interpretation will be to supply $\tau 1$ yefovey here and infra ver. 28. As, however, this is a rather harsh ellipse, we may suspect some corruption in the text. Perhaps the true reading is that of one or two MSS. Ti, for ded $\tau \ell$. This is confirmed even by thoee MSS. which are quoted in favour of $\tau c$ ouv, and perhaps by the Versions which are adduced in favour of miós oiv. The o might easily arise from the e pre-
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ceding. In the passage at ver. 28 . the true reading seems to be $\tau i$.
12. $\mathrm{H} \lambda i a \mathrm{as} \mu \dot{\ell} \nu-\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a]$ Here there is not any irony, (as some imagine), but rather a Synchoresis. Render, • Elias is, indeed, first to come and is to restore things to their former state.'
 passages that have more perplexed the Commentaters than this. Various attempts have been made to assign a satisfactory sense to the words of the common text $\kappa a l$ $\pi \bar{\omega} \bar{s}$. But all have failed, being more or less defective, either in sense, or construction, or both. This being the case, the most eminent Commentators have long agreed that the passage is corrupt ; and various modes of emendation have been proposed. Mere conjectures merit little attention. As to the varipus readings of MSS., not one is deserving of nolice, except that for vulg. $\kappa$ al $\pi$ m $\omega$, several antient MSS., with the later Syriac Version and Euthym. and Victor, read $\kappa a \neq \omega^{\prime}$. But even this will not render much service. Some therefore (as Beza, Campo., and Bp. Marsh) have resorted to the mild conjecture sal кa日ws. The sense assigned by Bp. Marsh is, "And that, as it is written of the Son of man, he (John the Baptist) may suffer many things and be set at nought.' Campb. renders, • And (as it is written of the Son of man) must likewise suffer many things and be contemned.' But even this method is objectionable, since it would be difficult to justify that sense of iva with the Subjunctive. Abandoning, therefore, all hope of emending the passage by any such mild means as the MSS. authorise, some recent Commentators have attempted to restore it by stronger methods. And as it appears that in this passage (as in the parallel one of Math. vii. $12 \propto 13$.) the fate of John Baptist and of Christ are meant to be paralleled, so they conceive that the substance of the two verses have been, by some accident, transposed ; and Gratz, Schulz, and Fritz. propose that the clause
 posed, and placed after $\delta \sigma a j i \theta \in \lambda \eta \sigma a \nu$; the
 celled as a double reading of the former. Thus the passage will stand as follows: 'H H ias $\mu \mathrm{e} \nu$





EGouòevuof (namely, the same with that given by Campb.), and the transposition is countenanced by the parallel passage of Math. xvii. $12 \& 13$. But as there is not the slightest authority for it , either in MSS. or Versions, it cannot be adopted in the text, nor ought it to be introduced into any Version. Indeed it may, after all, be unnecessary; for, adopting the reading val, ka* ais, \&c.,
 corresponding clause (which is often in such cases left to be understood from the context) oürow $\pi \dot{d} \sigma$ Xe, ' thus he (i.e. John Baptist) is to suffer.' This (which is strongly confirmed by the oütco cal of Matthew) yields quite as good a sense as either of the above methods; and that sense is produced by far milder means than, at least, the latter of them. The words $\kappa \alpha \theta \omega \dot{\circ}-$ aúтòv, are merely a òттroypaфía of the former, and therefore stand for nothing. Yet they strongly confirm the reading ka $\theta$ ais, (which is so indispensable to the emendation of the passage), especially as they are found in every one of the MSS. Campo. says he has transposed this clause; but he has sunk it in the former, which is, in fact, cancelling it. The omission of cal before $\kappa a \theta$ is very frequent in the MSS. of all writers. The Dative in $\dot{\epsilon} \pi o i \eta \sigma a \nu ~ i s ~ a ~ D a t i v u s ~$ commode, as in Isocr. Vic. 613. ar тaбxovtes
 cite.
15. $i \xi \in \theta a \mu \beta \eta^{\prime} \theta \eta$ ] 'valde obstupuerunt.' The word implies a mixture of admiration, veneration, and awe; all of them feelings well calculated to be excited by our Lord.
 was, that the man had brought his son to Jesus to be -healed by him. But our Lord not being immediately at hand, or the man not being witling to trouble our Lord, he presented his son to the Apostles for cure; since it was known that they had healed many such poor wretches.
 some recent Commentators urge, who adopt Mede's hypothesis on the Demoniacs, this can only signify, ' whose body was in the power of a damon who made him dumb.' So in Luke xi. 14. a deaf dæmon (i.e. one who causes deafness) is mentioned. Here Wets. compares Plat. T. ii. p. 438. (speaking of the Pythian priestess) $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\alpha}-$















18. äтov-катаं $\lambda \alpha \beta \eta$ ] Wets, and others remder, ' and wherever, or whenever, it may attack him; ' for the verb ката $\lambda a \mu \beta \dot{\nu} \epsilon i \nu$, they say, is often used of the attack of any disorder, especially of epilepsy. But the context demands that we should take ката́ $\alpha \beta \eta$ of the damon; and the sense is, 'wherever, or whenever, it lights on him,' or lays hold of him. 'Príaci aúvòv. Beza and others, with E. V., render it 'tears him.' But the true sense is, doubtless, that of the antient Versions and Commentators, and most modern ones, ‘dashes him on the ground ;' of which signification many examples from the Classical writers and the Sept. are adduced by the Commentators. T Tit' se rove $\delta \dot{\delta} \alpha$., ' gnashes or grinds his teeth.' So Theophyl. Sim. 91.

 These and the other particulars in this verse and ver. 22 . are indeed all symptoms of epilepsy. But if we even should suppose that the man was an epileptic, it would not the less follow that the disorder was induced by demoniacal power.

- $\xi$ nooiverat] Some antient and several moden Commentators explain, 'faints away,' 'falls into a swoon.' But however this may be a symptom of epilepsy, the word will not (as Fritz. observes) bear that sense, but must mean 'pines away.' 1 agree with that Commentator that the word denotes not so much what happens during the demon's attack, as it is a general consequence from thence. Thus Celsus says of epilepsy 'hominem consumat! The sal may be taken for val oürce, i. e. ë̈rce.

19. $\boldsymbol{a} \dot{\boldsymbol{i} \tau \bar{\omega}]}$ Many MSS. and Versions have aüroīs, which is edited by Griesb., Tittm., and Schorl, I think, without sufficient reason.
 taters, take ido iv for idóvra. But that is a false view of the construction, which Fritz. rightly regards as an anacoluthon. The Evangelist

 changed the construction $j$ of which see another example in Acts xx. 3. Wets, and Yates take dzàv as a Nominative absolute, supplying aütós.

time) when.' $\Pi$ atòtó $\theta \in \boldsymbol{c}$, , from his childhood.' This form and the kindred, but more elegant, one aatóóev are of later Grecism. The purer

20. Td $\pi \bar{v} \rho$ ] The Article, found in many antient MSS. and the Edit. Princ., is inserted by Math., Griebb., Fritz., and Scholz, and is confirmed by Math. xvii. 15. John xv. 6. Acts xxviii. 5. and other passages. Propriety, indeed, would seem to require this, since it falls under that rule of Middlet. by which all those utensils or substances in a house of which there is ordinarily but one, take the Article. Thus when $\pi \bar{u} \rho \rho$ signifies the fire in any house, it requires the Article; when it signifies any other, or fire in general, it rejects it. But whether, even in the former case, the Article was not sometimes omitted in phrases of frequent occurrene, is more than 1 would venture to affirm. Besides, the word may here be taken in a general sense; and if so, it needs no Article. Fritz. insets the Article even before vöaca; but purely from conjecture, and very wrongly; for that is used in a general sense. So we speak of ascidents " by fire and flood."

- ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon i \tau \iota$ ö́vazat] This use of ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ is said to be supplicatory. The truth is that the supplicatory, or rather hortatory, form results, as Fritz. observes, from the Imperative with which the particle is, in such a case, united. As to the eli $\tau t$ ö́vagat, some Commentators there recognise a doubt; while others deny any ; neither of which views seems well founded. Fritz. rightly regards it as a formula obtestationis entreating help. He cites Soph. Aj. 326. More apposite, however, is Dio Chrysost. p. 81. adduced by me in Recens. Synop.: exeivns
 See also Thucyd. vi. 25. Herodot. viii. 57. Of course, the very nature of this formula implies some doubt of the power of the person whose help is implored.
 thence Commentators have been somersherplexed, partly from the brevity an ness of the phraseology, and partly
of $\tau \dot{0}$. The conjectures that have
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are very clumsy and inefficient, and indeed unnecessary. Some, as Beza and De Dieu, and a recent English Commentator, would remove the difficulty as regards the $\tau \dot{\delta}$ by taking it for roüro. But that is a long exploded principle; and to supply ka $\alpha \dot{\alpha}$ (as does the last mentioned Commentators) is even more absurd. The best recent Commentators are, with reason, agreed that the $\tau d$ is here meant to be applied to the sentence following, by a use common in the Classical writers; where it is often applied to a whole sentence. See Winer's Gr. Gr. p. 54. Krebs, Rosenm., and Kuin. would extend the force of the $\tau \boldsymbol{j}$ to $\pi \iota \sigma \tau e \dot{v} o \nu \tau t$. But to produce the sense which they extract, they are obliged to insert an elvas after $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a$, and supply at the end of the sentence $\beta$ 明 $\theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \infty$ ooc or eiे êxec. But thus atvat could not but have been expressed; and the other ellipsis is harsh. The only satisfactory solution of the difficulty is that propounded in Recens. Synop., and which has been since adopted by Fritz., namely, to suppose that after $\pi$ raveivoat is to be supplied (what our Lord, from modesty suppressed)
 ing, $\langle\mu o l$ is omitted after dóvagal. The $\delta \dot{0}-$ $\nu a \sigma a t$, at which so many Critics stumble, is used with reference to the sóvagat of the ques-
tion, to which this is an answer. And the best way of accounting for the use of the rd is, to suppose, either that this mode of speaking was not unusual to our Lord in cases where his help was entreated with any sort of doubt; or that this answer was well known. Thus the sense will be 'the (well known answer).' All the best
 a Dativus commodi. Render, All things, are possible [to be done] for him who believeth;'
 Grot. rightly observes, is here meant not a total want of faith, but a deficient or wavering faith. The sense is,' 'I have a faith, but it is infirm; supply its deficiency, and regard it as complete, and heal my son accordingly.
 wards him.' The $\tau d$ at ' $\gamma \omega$ col $\dot{\text { d }} \pi \iota \tau$. is authoritatively emphatical.

28. $\quad$ öt $]$ I have shown, supra ver. 14., that the true reading here is probably $\tau i$.
29. Taperoopévouro] passed along. See Note
 mode of speaking like that at vii. 23. oudéva $\boldsymbol{\eta} \theta \in \lambda e \quad \gamma \nu \omega \nu a t$, signifying that he wished to travel in a private character.
30. Ta $\alpha a \delta \delta \delta o \tau a l]$ is being delivered, i.e. is shortly to be deliveted.'
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31. дуаука入ıбव́цєข os] Kypke, Elsn., and Wets. observe, that as the child was of somewhat advanced years, the signification here is not strictly 'to take up into the arms,' but to embrace.
 sense is, ' nemo anim meat auctoritate miraculum edt et poterit illico mini conviciari.' This construction (similar to that at 1 Cor. vi. 5.) is quite agreeable to Classical usage. So Plato Menex.

 Thucyd. ii. 51. ȧорia той | epãev́rovros. The |
| :---: |

 himself to,' \&c. (Fritz.)
 whether $\chi$ pr $\sigma$ s in the N.T. be a proper name, or an appellative. That it was originally an appellative descriptive of office and dignity, (like - $\beta a \pi r i \sigma \tau \eta s)$ seems certain, and so frequent is this use in the N.T., that some contend that it is never employed otherwise. But in Rom. V. 6. 1 Cor. i. $12 \& 23$. 2 Cor. iii. 3. Col. iii. 24. 1 Pet. i. 11. to render 'the anointed,' or even 'the Messiah,' would be harsh. Hence Middlet. maintains that in all those passages xptords is merely a proper name; and he contends that even during our Saviour's life xpiords had become such. Compare Matt. xxvii. 17 \& 20 . with Matt. x. 2. Camp., however, is of opinion that this use of the word was not introduced until after the resurrection. With the present passage Middlet. aptly compares a kindred one at 1 Cor. iii. 23. іциeĩs de xpıatoū, xpıatos de Өeoū. The same phrase elvai rios, to be devoted to
any one, occurs elsewhere in the N. T., and sometimes in the Classical writers.
43. Tais déo Xeĩpas ] 'both of your hands.' The Article has here the force of the possessive pronoun.
 from Is. lxvi. 24., where the punishments to be inflicted, in this life, on those who are disobedient to God, are vividly depicted, by the representation of their carcasses being strewed about, subject to the continual gnawing of worms, and the devouring of an unextinguishable fire, and to be objects of detestation to all future generatons. The words, however, are here applied to represent the eternal misery of Hell. The Sept.

 allusion has also been from the same passage in Ecclus. vii. 17. and Judith xvi. 17. Gehenna (which term has been fully explained in Math.) was with the Jews a frequent emblem of the place of torment. On the nature of the punish-
 $\pi \bar{v} \rho$, (scil. au $\bar{\omega} \bar{\nu}, \mathrm{i}$. e. of the wicked), namely, whether they are real and material, or figurative and designating the gnawing of self condemnaton, and the fire of extreme pain, the Fathers are divided in opinion, and sometimes speak inconsistently on this point. Some of them (as to several modern Commentators) adopt the latter opinion ; while others maintain that though the worm be figurative, the fire is material. The latter opinion is preferable to the former, but nevertheless is untenable is Fritz. ob-








serves) why should Gehenna be called $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ¢́є $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \nu \mathrm{a}$ тoí rupds but to designate that there the wicked are consumed with fire?" And (as he well argues) "what holds good of the latter member of the verse, must also hold good of the former." A confusion of the physical and figurative in the same sentence is not to be tolerated. There is, therefore, no doubt but that both expressions are to be taken in their literal sense. Fritz. also unhesitatingly admits, that both here and elsewhere in the N. T. the punishments of Hell are pronounced to be eternal. Indeed both the Jewish and Heathen writers alike held the doctrine of eternal punishments in store for impenitent sinners; on which subject see Recens. Synop.
49. тās $\left.\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho-\dot{\alpha} \lambda_{\iota} \sigma \theta_{n}{ }^{2} \sigma e \tau a \iota\right]$ There is perhaps no passage in the N. T'. which has so perplexed the Commentators, or so defied all efforts to assign to it any certain interpretation as this. It is impossible here to detail, much less review, even a tenth of the interpretations which have been proposed. It must suffice (omitting all mere conjectures or interpretations proceeding on a strained sense of the words) to notice those only which have any tolerable semblance of truth. These may be distributed into classes according to the leading view adopted. It is a material question whether the words are to be considered with reference to what went before, or taken as a separate dictum. The latter is supposed by some, especially Kuin., who maintains that this and the next verse are out of place and belong to some other part of the Gospel. This, however, is an unauthorized supposition, and has the disadvantage of depriving us of all benefit of a contert to shed some glimmer of light on this deep obscurity. Yet those who admit that the passage has a connexion with and reference to what precedes, are not agreed on the extent of it. Many refer it to the words immediately preceding, so that either a reason may be supposed given why the wicked in Hell will be tormented unto eternal life, or that ver. 49 may be considered as a further explication, or illustration, of what was said in ver. 48 ; for $\gamma \alpha \rho$ has often the sense of nempe. But the great objection to this mode of interpretation is, that it compels them to assign such a sense to $\pi$ âs as cannot be justified on any principle of, correct exegesis, namely, 'every wicked man,' or, 'every one (of those condemned to Hell).' As little can I approve of the sense of тāбa Ouría assigned by some of these Commentators, 'every one consecrated to God;' by which the salt is taken to mean the salt of grace. Many other varieties of interpretation are there founded upon this hypothesis, that the words have refer-
ence to those which immediately precede; every one of which, however, (as Fritz. has proved) is liable to very strong objections.

Let us now examine the other class of interpretations, namely, those which proceed on the principle, that the words have reference to ver. 47. Thus $\pi \hat{\alpha} s$ will denote ' every one of you,' ' every Christian.' 'Those, however, who adopt this view of the connexion are not agreed on the meaning of xupl $\dot{\alpha} \lambda_{\iota} \sigma \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \tau a \iota$. Here, as in the former class, there is a multitude of precarious and even absurd interpretations. Only two can be instanced which deserve any attention. 1. That of those who take $\pi u p i \alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \theta$. to mean 'shall be purified by the Holy Ghost.' See Matth. iii. 11. Acts iii. 3. They render: ' For every Christian will be seasoned with the fire (of the Holy Ghost), as (in the old Law) the precept was, every sacrifice shall be seasoned with salt ; q.d. "As ( Nal for $\omega$ s, as often) every sacrifice, under the Old Law, was to be seasoned with salt, so in the New, every Christian shall have a portion of the Holy Spirit.' But to assign such a sense to mopl is harsh, and we can scarcely suppose the Evangelist would word the sentence so renigmatically. In fact, the difficulty is chiefly centred in the interpretation of mupl, which is, no doubt, best taken by the antients generally and some moderns, as Beza, Rosenm., Kuin., and Fritz., to mean ' the fiery trials of life.' They are not, however, agreed on the sense of a $\lambda, \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \in \tau a z$. Beza and others take the meaning to be, 'Every Christian is purified by fiery trials of life, as every sacrifice is salted with salt.' But surely a $\lambda t \sigma \theta$. will not admit of such a sense. I do not hesitate to embrace the interpretation of $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$. proposed by $\mathrm{Bos}_{2}$ Muzel, and Fritz., especially as it is confirmed by the antient gloss doкıMav0rioerat, namely 'shall be put to the proof.' I agree with them, that the reference of this verse is not to ver. 47 only. (which Markl. also perceived ) but likewise to ver. 43-7. For, as Fritz. truly observes, "since Jesus has there thrice expressed the sentiment that a loss even of the members of the body, nay of those most useful, is to be encountered rather than to yield to the seductions of vice, that so being examined and approved, we may attain the prize of our high calling;' nothing can be expected but that we should show that such sort of trials (like those of athletes) are either very useful, or absolutely necessary." By rās must be understood all persons, all Christians, since to them ver. 43-48. belong. Iūp designates those fiery trials, in encountering which the self-denial and fortitude is compared to that of suffering the loas of a limb. IIvpl aid. may be interpreted, 'will be tried and prepared by such fiery trials (for the.
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enjoyment of eternal felicity).' There is here a metaphor taken from victims, which were prepared for sacrifice by the imposition of the mola salsa. The words of the next clause kal mára
 ii. 13. kal $\pi \hat{\alpha} \nu \dot{\partial} \dot{\omega} \rho o \nu ~ \theta v a i a s ~(i . ~ e . ~ e v e r y ~ s a c r i-~$ fice) $\dot{u} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu \alpha \lambda i \alpha \lambda \iota \sigma$ ríeral. And the кal is to be rendered sicuti, as, like the Heb. 7.

In ver. 50 there is a play on the double sense of salt ; for the word is first used, at ver. 49, in its proper sense; then, at ver. 50 , in its figurative one, where it denotes, as some say, the salt of friendship; but rather, we may suppose, with others, the salt of wisdom. See Coloss. iv. 6. Then after recommending the study of $u$ isdom, our Lord enjoins the cultivation of peace one with another.
 goeth,' or went. 'Avaoras properly signifies ' having arisen,' as often in the Classical writers; but it sometimes, as here, carries with it the added notion of departing. "Opıa Tīs 'I.,' the territory of Judæa.
5. Tpds tiv $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta$.] Literally, 'with a view to, \&c.
6. $\alpha \pi \dot{d} \delta \dot{d} \alpha \rho \chi$ ท̂s ктíceass] In this rase phrase xrlous signifies '. the things created,' the world or universe, as xiii. 19. 2 Pet. iii. 4. Sap. v. 18 \& xvi. 24. The argument meant to be urged by this and the verse following is, that God at the beginning of the world created man and woman that they should live together in the greatest union, and that hence married persons are to be
regarded not as two, but one, and therefore, by the Divine law, no divorce can be admitted.
10. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu T \hat{\eta}$ olkia] This seems to designate some inn, or private lodging, which they had occupied on the road; and the expression is here used in contradistinction to the public place where our Lord had been arguing with the Pharisees. Thus $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ т $\bar{y}$ olkía means much the same as privatim.

11, 12. In these two vy. there is a marvellous diversity of reading, which Griesb., Kuin., and Fritz., minutely discuss. It does not appear, however, that these readings authorize any change in the text. There may be some want of neatness in the phraseology, nay perhaps some want of precision in the use of one of the terms, namely $\dot{\alpha} \pi \boldsymbol{c}$ $\lambda u ́ \sigma y$ in ver. 12. But if the whole be taken as expressed populariter, there will be nothing to stumble at. It is true that, strictly speaking, a Jewish wife could not divorce her husband; for as to the examples of Salome and others, their actions were done in defiance of all law, and in imitation of Roman licentiousness. 'A therefore, at v.12. may, with many of the best Commentators, be considered as used with some license on account of the antithesis, for $\dot{\in} \xi \in \lambda \theta \hat{\eta}$
 MSS. and Versions, and is edited by Fritz.; but is plainly a gloss. There is the same catachresis at 1 Cor. vii. 12 \& 13. (where the Apostle may be supposed to have had this passage in mind) in
 róv. Perhaps, too, this term is used with reference to the customs of the Gentiles rather than
－Mate 19. Luc．18．15．
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the Jews，and seems to be meant to give a rule to the Apostles for general application，and which should put both sexes as on the same footing．

The aúrij is by some referred to the repu－ diated wife；by others，to the newly married one． Either may be admitted；but in the former case the sense of $d \pi l$ will be＇to the injury of；＇in the latter，＇in respect of，＇i．e．in his connexion with．

16．nù入óyet aúrá］＇pronounced，or invoked blessings upon them；for кaтךu入．，which occurs in some antient MSS．and is edited by Fritz． though plainly a gloss．
 ing（from thence）on his way．＇
19．$\mu \eta^{\prime}$ d $\left.\pi=\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \underline{y} \mathrm{~s}\right]$ Many Commentators are of opinion that the word is used in Scripture in a very extensive sense，so as to denote committing injustice of any kind；and to be nearly syno－ nymous with didixeiv．But dंखобтepeiv has a more special signification，and denotes to deprive any one of his property，whether by actual and open robbery，or by secret fraud，as denying a debt，cheating in the quality of goods sold，or overreaching in the bargain．Moreover，the words do not（as Wets．and others imagine）have re－ ference to the ninth and tenth Commandments， but，as Heupel observes，to the seventh，$\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ к $\lambda$＇$\psi$ ys，on which this is a sort of paraphrase，to show the extent of the injunction．Indeed the Jews were accustomed，in ordinary discourse， and even in writing，to recite the precepts of the Decalogue not in the very words in which they are expressed，but in other equivalent terms．
 there is much difference of opinion，which has
been occasioned by the fact that the young man did not follow our Lord＇s admonition．Some would adopt a sense of dyarā̃ by which it denotes to be content with．But the syntax is then very different．For then it is used of things， not persons，and is construed either with a Dative of object，or with a Participle，or an Infinitive． The other interpretations are divided between such as denote good will generally，＇he was kindly disposed towards him，＇or（as that has been by many supposed not sufficient）such as imply good will by some outward gesture or action．H．Steph．and Lightf．interpret，＇he kissed bim．＇But the authority for this sense is too slight．It is better，with Casaub．，Grot．， Wets．，Heum．，Kuin．，and Fritz．，to interpret ＇he accosted him kindly．＇After all，however， the interpretation ：he felt kindly disposed towards him，＇which is supported by the antient Commentators，is the most natural and probsble．
21．tois $\pi$ Troxois］The Article is omitted in very many MSS．and the Edit．Princ．，and is cancelled by Beng．，Matth．，Fritz．，and Scholz．
22．$\sigma$ тuyvácas ］＇This may be referred either to the countenance，or to the mind．In the former case it will denote that contraction of the coun－ tenance which ensues on hearing any thing which displeases one ：in the latter，it will signify per－ turbation．Thus，however，the term would be nearly the same with $\lambda u \pi o \cup \dot{\mu}$ evos just after．The former interpretation，therefore，seems preferable； and is confirmed by a passage of Nicetas ap． Schleus．Lex．oi dé катŋфıй̀теs каl orvyvá－ そovтes é ${ }^{\prime}$ ímóкov．And so Eurip．Hippol． 280. oтvyทì̀ ódpoúv．


















$\theta_{\alpha \mu \beta o u ̈ y r o] ~ ' w e r e ~ t h r o w n ~ i n t o ~ g r e a t ~}^{\text {a }}$ －aent and consternation．＇So ver．26．$\pi \varepsilon$－

 ritted in several MSS．most of them antient． et．thinks them undoubtedly spurious；and cancels them．Certainly propriety re－
$\therefore$ that $\dot{\rho} \dot{\alpha} \phi$ os，as it denotes a needle in $\because r a l$ ，should not have the Article．And then riety alike requires that if that be omitted， other too shall be left out．As，however，the er propriety is of too refined a kind to be ly to have been known to the Evangelist； － 1 as the idiom is found in our own language，it 1y be safer to leave the Article in question． puna入ıá is from $\tau \rho \dot{v} \omega$ ，tero，and is of the same ，rm with dं $\rho \mu a \lambda$ da．
－dee入应y］Very many MSS．，with some －athers，and the Edit．Princ．，have eloc $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon i \nu$ ， vhich is adopted by Wets．and Matth．But it would require much stronger evidence to justify 80 glaring a violation of propriety，for which Schulz in vain urges Matth．vii．13，because，as
 rivinjs should be supplied els $\tau$ riv Yooiv．
26．кal тís dévaтat $\sigma$ но．］As Matth．xix． 25. has Tis d $\rho a$ ，this has by many been regarded as a Hebraism．But кal thus prefired to $\tau t s$ is fre－ quent in the Classical writers，as appears from the examples adduced by Bos，Elsn．，and Wets． The кal in this use may be rendered＇aye（but）．＇ There is perhaps an ellipse of ápa．By the $\tau i s$ must be understood $\pi$ गóvoros．
29，30．There are marvellous diversities of reading in these verses，（especially the latter） and no slight difficulties have been moved on the interpretation of the words as they now stand． Two scruples have been raised，one as to the promise itself；the other as to its limitation，$\mu$ eva droypuin．With respect to the former，Campb．
has started a difficulty which he thought ad－ mitted of no solution，namely that in ver． 30 the words olkias－dypous seem to signify that the compensation shall be in kind，in this life；which could only mislead instead of enlightening．Be－ sides，that some things are mentioned at ver． 29. of which a man can have but one，as father and mother．And yet at ver． 30 we have the plural －mothers．Wife is mentioned at ver．29．，but not wives at ver． 30 ．According to rule（he adds） if one was repeated，all should have been re－ peated．And the construction required the plural number in all．In short，it is plain that he regarded the passage as an interpolation，as did also Pearce，Owen，and others．But the consent of all the MSS．and early Versions utterly dis－ countenances such a notion．As to the objec－ tions of Campb．，though they have been adopted and urged with his usual ability by Fritz．，they have，in reality，little or no force．We may safely maintain，with several Commentators an－ tient and modern，that the promise even as regarded as this world was（considering that
 $\pi \lambda a \sigma i o v a$, which indeed is found in the parallel passage of Luke and in some MSS．of that of Matthew）fulfilled literally in the Apostolic age． For the disciples as they travelled about，or were driven by persecutions，experienced every where the most unbounded hospitality from their brethren，insomuch that the advantage they had lost was amply made up to them．There is even less force in the other objections which have been urged．The strict regularity which Campb．and Fritz．desiderate is by no means a characteristic of the New Testament writers（indeed of few antient ones）and least of all of St．Mart．The irregularities they complain of are indeed all of them removed in one or other of the MSS．and those alterations received inem？by Fritz．，
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though in defiance of every principle of true Criticism. As to the plural number being require throughout er. 30 ., it surely makes no great difference whether the plural be adopted, or the singular. We might indeed, say that the singulur in things of which men have but one should have been used. Hence I have sometimes thought $\mu \eta \tau \epsilon \rho a$ should be read, from several MSS. The plural, however, may be tolerated, as referring to Christians at large. For though the declaration is commenced with outs, yet that is evidently intended of many. And though grammatical propriety confined the Evangelist to the use of the singular as to the things just adverted to in the first verse, yet in the second and more minute, he abandons it. Then again though three particulars are omitted in v. 30 , which have place in
 $\mu \eta \tau \dot{\epsilon} \rho a s$ might, in some measure, include the other; or, as there is very good authority for it in MSS. and Versions, and strong support in a well known critical principle, we might be justified in introducing cal maтépas into the text after cal $\mu \eta \tau \dot{\rho} \rho a s$. As to the omission of ruyaikas, it is not difficult to account for that; for not only delicacy forbade the introduction of this particular, but in reality it was a kind of loss which, in the nature of things, did not admit of being made up. What shall we, then, think of the judgment of Fritz., who, on the authority of only two MSS., inserts $\gamma$ vuaīкu?

As to the spiritual recompense mentioned by Campo. and anxiously sought for in many pious Commentators, "t the joy and peace in believing," which he says would more than counterbalance their losses, that, as is plain from this passage of St. Mark, was not adverted to by our Lord. And though it would seem but little that temporal remuneration was mentioned to the Apostles, yet it should be considered that that might be especially meant for the disciples at large. Thus Chrysostom in his Homily on Matt. xix. 27 \& seqq. p. 405. 40. acutely and





 $\boldsymbol{\mu} \lambda \lambda о \nu \tau \alpha \pi$ тбтойта.

But with respect to the other difficulty, viz. that found in the qualifying words, $\mu \in \tau \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \omega \gamma \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$, which taken in conjunction with a promise of
things merely temporal, has been thought by many so illusory that they have sought either to alter the reading $\delta \iota \omega \gamma \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ into $\delta^{\circ} \omega \gamma \mu \dot{\nu}$, or to take $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ in the sense after. But there is no authority for either change. The antient Commentators and several modern ones, as Beta, Leger. Heupel, Wolf, Wines, and Fritz., rightly take the sense to be 'under persecutions.' 'even amidst persecutions;' for where tribulation abounded, consolation should much more abound. This may perhaps be meant to hint at that piritual remuneration which should also compensate for the sacrifices which they might make in embracing and professing Christianity. Upon the whole, this remarkable passage may be regarded as one of those sayings of our Lord which were at once declarations, and prophecies. And the fulfilment of this in the latter view is strikingly manifest both from Scripture and from the Ecclesiastical History of the first Century.
32. $\dot{\epsilon}$ a $\mu \beta$ оиито, $\& \mathrm{cc}$.] On the nature of this wonder and fear the Commentators are divided in opinion. Some, as Heum., Rosenm., and Kuin. attribute it to the prediction which Christ now delivers of his death and passion, cal тapa入aßoiv, being rendered 'for he had taken them aside.' But this would involve an intolerable license of interpretation. It is better, with Euthym., Berra, and others, to suppose that the cause of their fear was our Lord's going to Jerusalem, notwithstanding the Sanhedrim were seeking to apprehand him; and the evils which he had said at ver.31. \& ix. 31. impended over him. As, however, they did not understand their Lord on that occasion, and were probably not then aware of the designs of the Sanhedrim, this view cannot well be admitted. Fritz. thinks it was a sort of involuntary presentiment of evil. Which is, I conceive, the truth, but not the whole truth, because it accounts for the dко入ou 0 out es $\dot{\text { e dp- }}$ ß (which is neglected by the Commentators) must be referred (as I suggested in Recens. Synop., and which view has since been adopted by some Commentators) to a certain undefinable aure with which the Apostles now began more and more to contemplate our Lord, and which, besides his many miracles, the increasing air of majesty and authority which he more and more assumed as his hour drew so near, was well calculated to inspire.
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#### Abstract

 IIpootopev́co日at тivı and ippós tıya is a phrase often used in the Sept．for mporśpXeo日at тivi．

37．$\& v \cdot \tau \bar{\eta} \delta \delta^{\prime} \xi \eta$ oov］＇in thy state of glory and majesty in thy reign．＇  MSS．and Versions，and is cancelled by Matth．， Griesb．，Vat．，and Scholz；but is with more judgment retained by Tittm．and Fritz．Versions are in this case no certain testimony．

42．oi doxoūvres ápXciv］Many Commenta－ tors regard the participle as redundant ；and to this opinion the most recent English Commenta－ tors cling，adducing from the above a cloud of examples，most of them not to the purpose．I have myself always objected to any such prin－ ciple，whether in the Scriptures or the Classical writers；and this view is supported by the opi－ nion of Fritz．，who pronounces that the word is no where pleonastic．See the numerous examples which I have adduced from the Classical writers in Recens．Synop．We may here render either，


with Grot．，＇qui imperare censentur，＇or，with Fritz．，＇qui sibi imperare videntur．＇The former， however，is strongly confirmed by my citations in Recensio．
－ol $\mu$ еуá $\lambda_{0}$ aúт $\bar{\omega} \nu$ ］The sense is，＇the great ones（magnates）among them．＇Fritz．calls this a mira dictio．It may rather be considered as a dictio popularis．＇Kacєそovaıá\}ovaıv, i. e. as Casaub．renders，imperium in eorum nomine exercent．

46．Baprifacos］Some take this for a patrony－ mic，or explication of $\dot{\delta}$ vids Tıuaiou．Others， however，with more reason，consider it as a real name，and think the person was called Bapri－ matos and was the son of Timæus．So Bap日o入o－ maîos and Baptทroûs，and in Thucẏd．i． 29. IrapXiठas тoü Toduaiov．In such cases the patronymic has been converted into a regular appellative．There is some resemblance to those names which have the form only，without the sig－ nification ；on which see my Note on Thucyd．i． 1. －$\pi \rho \circ \sigma a t \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ ］The xgos is not（as some
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early Editions, and is received by Wets., Griesb., Math., Fritz., Titty. and Scholz. Grammatical propriety requires it, but that Mark so wrote is far from certain.
15. $\left.\eta_{j} \rho \xi a \tau o d x \beta a \lambda \lambda e \iota \nu\right]$ This is not, as most Commentators imagine, for $\ddagger \xi \in \dot{\beta} \beta a \lambda e$, but the sense is, ' he proceeded to cast out.'
16. ठ̇єеvé $\gamma \kappa \eta$ бкevios] This is usually understood to mean any vessel, i.e. devoted to profane uses, and by which any gain was made. But the word $\sigma x \in \hat{v} o s$, which in the Sept. corresponds to the Heb. .כב, has, like that word, a considerable latitude of signification, and denotes, like the Latin vas, or instrumentum, a utensil (whether for sacred or profane use) or piece of furniture or dress, and, in a general sense, an article, whether for use or traffic.

In doing this our Lord merely upheld the Jewish Canons, (founded on Levit. xix. 20, and Deut. xii. 5.), which, as we find from the Rabbinical writers, define the reverence of the Temple (i.e. the outer Court!) to mean that none should go into it with his staff, shoes, or
purse, or with dust upon his feet; and that none
should make it a thoroughfare. The irregularities which our Lord rebukes had (as Whity supposes) originated in, or been increased by the proximity of the Castle of Antonia; and the Priests, having an interest in, connived at them.
22. èхeтe жiotเy $\theta_{\text {coil }}$ Some take this to mean, 'have a strong faith ;' by a common Hebraism, whereby the genitive of "God" subjoined to substantives denotes greatness or excellence. But there is no reason to abandon the common interpretation by which $\Theta$ eos is a Genifive of object or end, as in Rom. iii. 22. Gal. ii. 20. iii. $22 .$, and especially with riots. Of course, it is implied that the faith which is reposed in God shall be firm and undoubting, as the words following suggest and illustrate.
 before, is a Dative of possession and property.
25. el $\tau t$ ] for ${ }^{\circ}, \tau_{t}$; an idiom frequent in the Classical writers, and sometimes found in the Scriptural ones, as xiii. 9.
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 Scribes and the Commentators alike stumble at this construction, and endeavour to remove the difficulty or irregularity by various methods, all of them fruitless and indeed unnecessary. For there is no need to supply, with some, $\tau \mathfrak{i}$ levin-
 says, an anacoluthon (frequent in the best writens) by which the Evangelist passes from the very words of the persons spoken of, to a napration of what was said; a sort of idiom similar to that by which there is a transition from the oration directa to the oblique. Thus eq оßoüvтo

XII. 1. iv $\pi a \rho \alpha \beta o \lambda \alpha i \bar{s}]$ Beta rightly regards this as denoting the genus orations, and as equivalent to $\pi a \rho a \beta \lambda \gamma \delta \partial \eta \nu$; for our Lord probably spoke several, though the Evangelist has recorded only one.
 hands of the husbandman.' At $\tau \bar{\omega}$ к at $\rho \overline{\tilde{\omega}}$ just before sub. $\dot{e}$ or $i \pi i$. By jatos is here meant


$\dot{e} \kappa \epsilon \phi a \lambda$. the Commentators are divided in opnon. But almost all the interpretations proposed are objectionable, either as straining the sense by arbitrary ellipses, or as assigning significations which either are not inherent in the word, or are frigid and unsuitable. The true sense seems to be that expressed by the Syr., Vulg., and other Versions, and some modern Translations, ( as E. V.), and adopted by Beza., Misc., Casaub., Heupel, Rosenm., Schleus.; Kain., and Fritz. 'wounded him in the head.' Thus $\lambda_{t} \theta o \beta o \lambda$. will denote the manner and instrument, i.e. 'by pelting him with stones.' This interpretation is moreover confirmed by the трavলaтí\} $\epsilon \nu$ of Luke. And although this signification of the verb is perhaps without example, yet it is strongly supported by the analogy of the language, as in the verbs $\gamma \nu a \theta o u ̄ \nu, \gamma u$ suv,
 niously treated.' This form ( $\dot{i} \iota \mu \alpha{ }^{\prime} \omega$ for $d \tau \iota \mu-$ $\dot{\alpha} \zeta(\omega)$ occurs no where else in the N.T. But the Evangelist has many such peculiarities, derived, no doubt, from the language of common life.






 1 Pet 2. 7 .

 $\dot{\alpha} \phi \in ́ v \tau e s ~ a \dot{u} \tau \dot{\partial} \nu, \dot{a} \pi \grave{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$.
${ }^{2}$ Math 82. 15. ${ }^{15}$ 20.20.




























[^8]14. ' ел' $d \lambda \eta \theta e i a s]$ for $6 \pi$ ' $d \lambda \eta \theta e i a$, which $o c$ curs in Matth. Examples are frequent both in the Classical and Scriptural writers.
 Classical and Scriptural writers, used as applied to legislation, and then denotes to prescribe, enact. 24. oi $\delta(\alpha \dot{ }$ - - eoî $]$ The interrogation here implies a strong affirmation.

















26. $\dot{\text { 2xil }}$ ris Baitov] This is commonly taken to mean ' in the place where he treats of the bush.' But the most eminent Commentators have long adopted the view taken by Beza and Jablonski, who regard this as a form of citing Scripture usual, in that age, with the Jewish Doctors, namely, that of referring to any particular part of Scripture by naming some remarkable circumstance therein narrated. Thus the sense will be, ' in the portion which treats of the burning bush.'

 instance Suetonius in Augusto, and in Nerone. It may be added, that antient Critics cite various parts of Homer in a similar manner; e. gr. dv
 mavrific. Nay, Thucydides i. 9. himself refers
 where see my Note.

With respect to the Article, it is not certain whether $\tau \overline{j s}$ be the true reading, or rov. But although rou is found in very many of the best MSS., and is received by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz; yet, as the masculine is found only in the earlier Classical writers, not in the later ones, who use the feminine, I have with Fritz., retained the common reading.
27. Өais そcovrciovj Many good MSS., together with some Versions, and Euthym. and Theophyl. omit the Oeds, which is cancelled, perhaps without good reason, by Griesb., Fritz., and Scholz.
28. Taciov] Very many MSS., have here and just after ráyrcoy, which is preferred by Mill and Beng., and edited by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. But with the idiom by which in certain formulas జávresv (in the neuter) is put in the sense all things, (thus Fritz. cites Aristoph. Av. 473. and Thucyd. iv. 52. kal ivv

 even in the Classical writers, it is unlikely that
the Evangelist should have been acquainted, and I know of no example where the ravroov is thus brought into immediate concurrence with the Genit. feminine. That indeed is generally omitted. Perhaps, as the authority for the former mavros is greatly superior to that for the latter, Mark

 the scribes would be likely to alter into mávr๓y, to adopt it to the former paseage. Certainly тávroy cannot (as some imagine) be a masculine, and have reference to $\nu \delta \mu \operatorname{cov}$.
29. Kúplos-dortl] Vitringa and Campb. take the words as forming two sentences. "The Lord is our God : the Lord is one." But though the verb substantive be omitted in the Hebrew, yet the idiom of that language will not permit the separation of the words pronk and mir; the construction in Greek will as little permit it. Besides, in the usual manner of taking the passage, the grand doctrine of the Unity of the Godhead is more impressively inculcated.
31. $\delta \mu o i \alpha$ aUTク] There is here a variation in reading ; some MSS. and Versions, with Euthym. and Victor having opola aivy ; others, duola aüris; others, again, $\delta \mu o i a$ тavin. The first is preforable, and has been approved by Mill and Heupel, and edited by Fritz. But as the evidence for it is very slight, (for that of the Versions is scarcely to be admitted), and as all the varr. lecth. seem to be so many ways of removing the difficulty of the common reading, it ought not to have been received into the tant; it was probably derived from St. Matthew. The sense is, - The second is like [unto it, i.e. in importance] namely, this.' Fritz., indeed, scruples at this absolute use of 8 Motos; but it is found in the Classical writers, and though it may not occur elsewhere in the Scriptural ones, that might be by accident, especially as it does not often occur any where.
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ter，thou hast spoken well．＇$\theta$ cos before cis éort is absent from a considerable portion of the best MSS．，several Versions，and the Ed．Princ． and Beng．It is plainly from the margin，and is rightly cancelled by Wets，Matth．，Griesb．， Tittm．，Vat．，Fritz．，and Scholz．IÌウ̀̀ aùroū is omitted in some MSS．，but is defended by many Classical passages cited by the Commen－ tators；to which may be added one more ap－ posite than any of them from Aristoph．Plut．
 Note on Thucyd．ii．9．No． 5.
33．ovyé $c \cos$ ］This is not，as Schleus．and Wahl．imagine，for $\psi u \chi{ }^{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ ，but for scavoias at ver．30．Iौє̇̃ov．Sub．Х $\rho \bar{\eta} \mu a$ ，a greater thing， of more value and excellence in the sight of God．
34．i8civ－dxexpi $\theta_{\eta}$ ］Put by attraction for I8civ öTt，\＆c．＇perceiving that he had answered wisely．＇Nounex $\overline{\text { cos }}$ is later Greek for the earlier vouvexóvтcos．The words кal oúdels－íтepoo－ т $\bar{\eta} \sigma a \iota$ refer（as Fritz．observes）not to the im－ mediately preceding narrative，28－34．，but to the whole from 13－34．
 omitted in many of the best MSS．，and in the Ed．Princ．and several early Editions，and is cancelled by Griesb．，Matth．，Tittm．，Vat．， Fritz．，and Scholz．；and rightly，because the omission is not only confirmed by the Var．lect． in Matt．xxii．43．，but by the context，which， says Middlet．，requires the influence of the Holy Spirit．Yet Fritz．has truly observed that
 the N．T．without the Article，though in the sense＇the Holy Spirit，＇because the appellative notion of $\tau \delta$ туe
use passed into a proper name，as in the case of $\Delta \iota \alpha \beta o \lambda o s$ for Satan．The opinion（he adds）
 afflatus sprung from that frequent confounding of significatio and sensus，on which much might be said．Be that as it may，he is probably right in here rendering＇instigante Spiritu Divino．＇

I have，just before，with Fritz．，edited $\lambda$ é $\gamma \in t$ ， for eimev；for though the direct evidence for it is but slight，yet the indirect is very strong，since （as Fritz．observes）it is found in the parallel passages of Mark and Luke，and is confirmed by the $\lambda$ é $\gamma \in \iota$ ，at ver．37．I would add，that the גéyet of very numerous MSS．and Editions for eIrcv，in the next clause（which，therefore， Matth．，Griesb．，and Scholz receive into the text，though at variance with the Sept．and the parallel passages of Matthew and Luke）is，I doubt not，meant for this；a sort of mistake fre－ quent in all authors．Finally，propriety would seem to require that $\lambda$ é $\gamma \in \iota \nu$ should be used of a man，（as David）and elmety of God，the latter being a more significant and authoritative term．

38．$\sigma$ ro入ais ］The $\sigma$ ro入 $\eta$ was an Oriental gar－ ment descending to the ancles，and worn by per－ sons of distinction，as Kings，（ 1 Chron．xv． 26. Jon．ii．6．）Priests，（ 3 Esdr．i．1．v．81）and honourable persons．See Xen．Cyr．i．4， 26. ii．4，1．Luke xv．22．These oronal were affected by the Lawyers of the Pharisaical sect． （Kuin．）

40．oi кateodiontes，\＆c．］This is by most Commentators esteemed a solecism：but similar constructions are found in the Classical writers． It is better regarded by some recent Commenta－ tors as an example of anacoluthon．Fritz．，how－ ever，objects to that principle，as unsuitable to
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the simplicity of construction in the passage ； and he would take the whole sentence as excla－ matory，＇these devourers！＇\＆cc．，these shall re－ ceive，\＆c．I prefer，however，with Grot．，to suppose an Asyndeton，and render，＇those who devour，＇\＆c．，＇those shall receive，＇\＆c．；which method involves the least of difficulty．
41．кäías ］＇while he sat．＇「a̧oфu入áкıov． A word rarely found out of the New Testament， except in the Sept．and Josephus．The yáYa （which signifies riches）is by Brisson de Regn． Pers．i．181．derived from the Persian．Xa入кdу． As we say brass or silver，for brass＇or silver money．

42． रextà $^{\text {］}}$ The $\lambda$ entrd was a very minute coin，the half of a quadrans，or farthing．It is in our common translation rendered mite，which word comes from minute，as farthing from fourth－ ing，formed in imitation of quadrans．

43．$\pi$ גeiov］i．e．more in proportion to her substance．

44．éк тoù тeptroevoutos aùvīs］for ík toù тepıo天eúpatos，which is found in some MSS． here and at Matthew and Luke，but is doubtless， a glose．Tòv $\beta$ iov aürìs，＇her means of living；＇ a signification of $\beta$ los（like the Latin vita） common both in the Classical writers and the Sept．

XIII．1．тотатоl $\lambda\left\{\theta_{0}\right.$ ］These were indeed
stupendous ；in proof of which the Commenta－ tors adduce Joseph．Bell．v．5，6．，（from which passage it would seem that the stones of the temple were some of them 45 cubits long，five high，and six broad）and Joseph．Ant．xv．11， 3. It is strange，however，they did not see that the latter account，as far as it regards the dimensions of the stones，makes the former one almost in－ credible．For it represents them as about 25 cubits long ； 8 in height，and about 12 in depth． It is not so much the excessive length spoken of （for in Bell．i．21，6．Josephus speaks of the stones of Strato tower as some of them 50 feet long， 9 high，and 10 broad）as the disproportion in breadth，which affords room for suspicion． And as this account differs so materially from the other in Josephus，I cannot but suspect that for $\mu^{\prime}$ we should read $\kappa^{\prime}$ ，which will make them tuenty－fire．Thus both accounts will exactly tally．I cannot omit to add，that though I have carefully noted almost all the accounts which the antients have left us as to the dimensions of stones used for building，I have never found any others to exceed 35 feet．The exclamation of the Apostles here is illustrated by what Josephus says at Bell．v．5，6．namely，that the whole of the exterior of the Temple，both as regarded stones and workmanship，was calculated to excite astonishment（ $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\kappa} \kappa \pi \lambda \eta \xi \nu \nu$ ．）
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 writers, is used of the fore-thought, study, and elaboration of Orations, in opposition to ertemporary oratory. Thus the declamations of the

Rhetoricians were called $\mu e \lambda \epsilon \epsilon a \ell$.
 concrete, per emphasin.

 ắкpov oúpavov̂.
























32. n.] This (for the common reading кal) is found in most of the antient MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz.
XIV. 3. xrotinis] With this word the Commentators have been not a little perplexed, and hence their opinions are very various. Besides conjectural alterations, and derivations from some name of place, which are alike inadmissible, there are thres interpretations worthy of notice; 1. that of Camer., Beza, Grot., Wets., and Rosenm., who think that riarinds is put, per
 for sestario. And this is somewhat confirmed by the Vulgate Spicati. Otherwise, however, there is little authority for it, or indeed probability; for why (as Fritz. remarks) should not St. Mark have at once used бтiка́тоs, as Galen often does? 2. Others, as Erasm., Luther, Vatabl., Suic., Capell., Casaub., Salmas., Scalig:, Le Clerc, Beng., Kypke, Heum., Kuin., Tittm., and Wahl., derive the word from xiotis, (as from ма́vтıs, رavrıкds; from xpâkıs, тракTikds; from kplats, кpitikds), and take it to signify pure, genuine, unadulterated. For that
nand was often adulterated, appears from Pliny and Diosc. Fritz., however, objects that then mootikds would be qui fidem vel facere vel habere potest, a signification plainly unsuitable to nard. And to derive the term from wiords, would lead to a like result. 3. Pisc., H. Steph., Schmid, Schwartz, Heupel, Fischer,Schneider, Schleusn., and Fritz. derive it from xivetv or wieì, (or, as

 adjectives in - «xós are often derived from verbals in -ros.) and they take it to mean liquid. Fritz., however, explains potable. But though he shows from some passages of Athenzus that unguents were sometimes drunk by the antients, yet the other sense is greatly preferable. Upon the whole, Fritz. has better succeeded in proving that the interpretation liquid or potable is probably true, than that the preceding one is certainly false. The trifling abuse he complains of will not be fatal to that interpretation, for it may very well be that Mark here (as occasionally elsewhere) uses a term of the idiomatical Greek; and as the interpretation is strongly supported by the antient Versions and Fathers, I see no reason to abandon it.
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Mo入ure入oüs may be taken either with $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho o u$ ， or with $\boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\rho} o u$.
－кal $\sigma u y \tau \rho[\psi a \sigma a]$ Here again the Com－ mentators are at issue on the sense of $\sigma u v T \rho$ i－廿ara．Some take it to mean＇having broken it in pieces；＇others，＇having shaken it up．＇But the former would be unnecessary，and unsuitable to the purpose in view；and the latter interpre－ tation proceeds too much upon hypothesis，and is utterly repugnant to the sense of the word，as is that of others，＇rubbing it in．＇The true in－ terpretation is，no doubt，that of Drus．，De Dieu，Krebs，Rosenm．，Kuin．，Schleusn，Wahl．， Bretschn．，and Fritz．，who take it to mean ＇diffracto orificio，alabastrum aperuit．＇The term was，it seems，used of the opening of flasks of oil or liquid ointment，which was by knocking off the tip end of the narrow neck，where the orifice was sealed up，to preserve the contents；and this，plainly，might be done without wasting the contents．The above view of the sense is con－ firmed by the antient Versions，which express the general signification＇aperuerunt．＇．
 most all the best MSS．and early Editions，in－ cluding the Editio Princ．；and is alopted by Wets．，and edited by Beng．，Matth．，Vat．，Tittm．， Fritz．，and Scholz；and，no doubt，rightly；for
its Hebrew character and greater difficulty attests its genuineness．
 like that of habere in Latin，common in the Clas－
 ticipated．＇Fritz．remarks that тоо入а $\mu \beta \alpha^{\nu} \nu \omega$ answers to the Latin antecapio，anteverto，cecupo， presumo ；and as occupo is often joined with an Accus．and sometimes with an Infinitive，so is т $\rho o \lambda a \mu \beta \alpha \dot{\nu} \nu \infty$ mostly coupled with an Accus．， though sometimes with an Infinitive．He ren－ ders，＇occupavit corpus meum ungere ad pol－ lincturam．＇

13．$a \nu \theta$ рштоs］From the word being opposed to olkodeorót $\boldsymbol{s}$ in the following verse，and from the servile nature of the occupation，it may be inferred that this was a domestic．Kepáptov． The Commentators concur in recognizing here an ellipse of $\sigma \kappa$ evos，or $d \gamma \gamma \epsilon i o v$ ；and they pro－ duce examples both of the elliptical and the complete phrase．But the examples of the latter have кєpaueiov，which is，beyond doubt， an adjective，whereas кepd $\alpha t o y$ ，as Fritz．shows， was always considered as a substantive．
14．кaтá入v $\mu a]$ See Note on Luke ii．15， 7.
15．$\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \dot{\gamma} \gamma \in o \nu]$ An upper room such as those which the Jews used for the same purposes as those to which our dining－rooms，parlours，and
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cloeets are applied. 'Botpøpévov. This word (which Campb. renders carpeted) has a reference to preparation of beds, couches, or sofas, carpets, pillows, stools, \&cc., such as among the Oriental nations supply the place of chairs, tables, and indeed almost all the other furniture of a room.

For deajeov Griesb., Fritz., Knapp, and Scholz edit dyáratoy, which is found in the best MSS., and is most agreeable to the style of the N. T.
19. eTs кat' $\kappa$ Is] A Hebrew idiom for nat' zya, as the Commentators say; but it is found
also in other writers, though indeed almost wholly those who formed their style on the N. T. Fritz. has abundantly proved that the кaтá cannot be taken, as some suppose, for кal elia.
30. $\sigma i$ ] This is found in almost all the antient MSS. and the early Edd., including the Ed. Princ. It is also confirmed by most of the antient Versions, and has been with reason received by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Vater, Tittm., Fritz., and Scholz. It was, no doubt, absorbed by the of following. The word is emphatical.
${ }^{2}$ Infr.' 16. Joh. 2. 19.
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'agreed not together.' Erasm., Grot., Hamm., Whitby, Heup., and Campb. render it, 'non idonea erant,' 'were insufficient to establish the charges against him.' But, as Beza and Fritz. observe, the usus loquendi will not permit this sense; and the difficulty which has compelled the above Commentators to adopt so forced an interpretation is really by no means formidable, as has been shown by Wolf., whom see in Recens. Synop. Lightf. observes, that the Jewish Canons divided testimonies into three kinds, 1. a vain or discordant testimony; 2. a standing or presumptive testimony; 3. an even testimony.
58. Xecposiointoy] i.e. 'the work of man.'

This was added (says Grot.) lest Christ should seem to have spoken parabolically. Of the word Xecpor. examples are adduced by Wets., to which may be added a passage of Thucyd. ii. 77. yet more apposite, where $\phi \lambda d \xi$ xciposoorirn is opposed to aंगd тavtonáтov тvp. Our Lord alluded to Is. xvi. 12. See Note on Acts vii. 48.
68. oúx- $\lambda$ éyess] This is rightly regarded by Wets. as an idiomatical form of negation. And he subjoins many examples, both from the Classical and Rabbinical writers.
 tators have been exceedingly perplexed, and hence their interpretations are remarkably dis-
 Matt．27． 1.
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cordant．To omit conjectural alterations，and absurd interpretations，there are five which have a semblance of truth．1．Many Commentators take $\dot{d} \pi\left\langle\beta \alpha^{2} \lambda_{\text {cis }}\right.$ here in the sense begin，and regard $\dot{i} \pi \mu \beta \lambda$ civ y $i \kappa \lambda a c e$ as standing for $\kappa \lambda a i e t y$, drip i $\beta$ 立e，either in the sense＇began to weep，＇ or＇proceeded to weep，＇as in Acts xi．4．d $\rho \xi$ g．
 That passage，however，has another sense．Be－ sides，though the above signification of $亠 \pi \times 1 \beta d \lambda$－ News does exist in the later writers，yet of the hypallage in these words no example has been adduced．Besides，the sense is so weak and even frigid that，although it is supported by most of the antient Versions，it cannot well be ad－ mitred．In fact there is no hypallage，but an ellipsis，though to determine it with certainty is perhaps impossible．The simplest method would be，with some，to take dr ı $\beta a \lambda \omega i \nu$ to mean＇having rushed out of doors；＇a sense which cannot be accused of feebleness．Yet such a signification of $d \pi \iota \beta a \lambda \lambda e t y$ has never been established，the passages cited being little or nothing to the pur－ pose．There seems no doubt but that the truth lies with one or other of the two following inter－ pretations．1．That of Casaub．，Bows，Heupel， Kyple，Wets．，Koecher，Camp．，and others； including E．V．，＇having reflected thereon；＇ which is a very suitable sense，and supported by the parallel passages．Abundant examples are adduced，not only of the complete phrase $E \pi t$－ $\beta_{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon t \nu$ T $\delta \dot{\nu} \nu$ your，but even some of the ellip． tical ones．Yet，as Fritz．remarks，the latter is only found where the context suggests the notion of attention；which is not the case here．He， therefore，after a minute discussion of the merits of all the interpretations，decides in favour of that of Chrysost．，Theophyl．，and other Greek Fathers，and to which several eminent modern

Commentators have inclined，（as Casaub．，Sal－ mas．，Sic．，Elsn．，Heum．，Krebs，and Fischer）， by which $d \pi t \beta \alpha \lambda \omega^{\prime} y$ is taken as equivalent to
 his vest．）＇But here，again，decisive authority is wanting；for though the complete phrase
 frequent，yet not one example has been adduced of the elliptical one．To this，indeed，Fritz． answers that，from the great frequency of the phrase，no additional word was necessary to decide，the sense；which is（he remarks）the case
 meyos．That the action is suitable to extreme grief，none can doubt；and that it was in use among the antients，is proved by a cloud of examples．As to the objections urged by Campo． to this mode of expressing grief on the present occasion，they are not entitled to any serious attention．
XV．6． $\left.\boldsymbol{i} \pi{ }^{2}{ }^{2} v e r\right]$＇used to release；＇as in Math．elcóvet dxo八úecv．
 fellow rebels：＇The Commentators observe that， to what sedition this alludes is not known，either from Josephus or elsewhere．But indeed that whole period was filled with seditions．Hoceìv фóvov is a phrase found only in the later wri－ tens．
li．dyé $\sigma \epsilon \sigma a \nu]$ instigated，concitabant．Some MSS．have dעézeloay，and others éretoay．The one is a gloss，and the other derived from the parallel passage of Matthew．The textual read－ ing，which is a stronger term，is defended by Luke xxiii．5．and this use of the word is con－ firmed by the examples produced from Diod． Sic．by Eisner and Munthe，to which may be added Furip．Orest．612．and Diony Hol＿viii． 81．Hesych．$\alpha \nu a \sigma e i \omega . ~ d \nu a \pi e i \theta_{0}$.
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14. $\tau$ [ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ кakóv] The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ refers to a clause suppressed, as, 'Why should I crucify him, for' $\& c$.
 the wishes of the people,' or, as Grot. explains it, agreeably to the usage of satis facere in the Latin writers, 'efficere ne alter habeat quod queratur.'
 which is used by Matth. The phrase signifies to place the knees (i.e. on the ground.) so titévas and ponere often denote to lay any thing down.
15. 'A Ale . kal 'P.] Persons probably well known, and then living at Rome, since Paul, Rom. xvi. 13. salutes Rufus there.
16. $\tau i=\tau i \dot{d} \dot{d} \eta]$ Due h. 1. interrogationes nulla copula interposita in unam sententiam de Gr acorum et Romanorum usu colligate sunt, ut sensus ad nostram cogitandi dicendique rationem sic constituendus sit: sortem vestimentorum ratione jacientes ut definiretur quis aliquid nancisceretur, et quid is acciperet. (Fritz.)
 edited on the authority of nearly all the best MSS., and after the example of every Editor from Wets. to Scholz.

difficulty is here raised by some Commentators, namely, that the crucifixion is twice described by Mark as taking place. To avoid which, some would take the kal for $\bar{\epsilon} \xi=\dot{0}$. But that signification is quite nnauthorized. Others endeavour to remove the difficulty by a change of punctuation, \&c. But that involves a most harsh construction. It is better, with others (among whom is Fritz.) to take doráupwonav as an Aorist with a Pluperfect sense, (on which use see Winer's Gr. Gr. p. 106.) thus: 'It was the third hour when they had crucified him.' Even this, however, is unnecessary, if oraypwovayres in the preceding verse be taken, as it may, in a present sense, (and indeed the Cod. Vatic. has the present tense), thus: 'And on proceeding to crucify him, they divided his garments.' Now this indicates the commencement of action, namely, the stripping of our Lord. The next verse denotes the completion of action, and fixes the time when it took place. Thus the sense of v. 25 , when expressed in the order usual to Western composition, will be, "And (now) they crucified him, it being then the third hour.' Thus the objection in question is removed.

With respect to the dvavitoфdivela between Mark and John, as to the hour of the crucifixion, various methods have been proposed for its re-
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moval. See Recens. Synop. Now although such discrepancies "are (as Fritz. observes) rather to be patiently borne, than removed by rash measures," yet here we are, I conceive, not reduced to any great necessity. For although the mode of reconciling the two accounts by a sort of management (however it may be approved by many Commentators) is not to be commended, yet surely, when we have the testimony of several of the antient Fathers, that an early corruption of number in one of these two passages had taken place by a confusion of the I and 5 , we cannot hesitate to adopt so natural a mode of removing the discrepancy. See more in Note on Joh. xix. 14.
28. This $v$. is marked for omission by Griesb. and cancelled by Fritz.; but injudiciously; for there is no reason why so remarkable a fulfilment of prophecy, mentioned by the other Evangelists, should not also be mentioned by Mark. Besides, the number of MSS. in which it is omitted is so comparatively small, that it is very probable this was inadvertently omitted by the Scribes; which might arise from this and the next v . both beginning with a kal.
29. ovia] An interjection of derision and in-
sult, like the Latin vah, and our hoa! oho! ahah! which, however, are used, like all interjections, with much latitude of signification, and are adapted to express most of the violent emotions.
31. $8 \varepsilon$ ] This is absent from many good MSS., and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., 1ittm., Vat., Fritz., and Scholz.
36. ка日є入єì ] A vox solennis de hac re. See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 14.
 fies to send forth a voice, whether articulate or inarticulate. See Note on Matt. xxvii. 50 .
39. \% \%t oivico к $\rho d \xi a s$ ] This does not mean (as many explain) that he had cried with such a loud voice ; nor that the Centurion felt admiration at his being so soon released from his torments, but that, on hearing such words as those at ver. 34. pronounced as it were from the bottom of his heart by the crucified person, and that he should so immediately after be released from his torments, the Centurion thence felt assured that he was not only a righteous person, but held the character which he claimed, namely that of $\dot{j}$ vids toū $\theta \in o \bar{u}$, on the force of which expression see Note on Matt. xxvii. 54

 cis 'Іеробó $\lambda \nu \mu$ а.
c Matt. 27.









 4.



- Matt. 28.
1.uc. 24. 1.
I.uc. 24. 1.
Joh. 20. 1.
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42. тооба́ $\beta$ 及atov $]$ A very rare word only occurring elsewhere in Judith viii. 6., and by which, as he was writing for Gentiles, Mark explains the Jewish sense of tapaokevi่.
43. ci $\left.\sigma \times{ }^{\eta} \mu \omega \nu\right]$ 'respectable, honourable.' The word properly signifies of good presence, then decorous, dignified, \&c. It is never used in this sense by the Classical writers, but occurs so
 $\mu o ́ v c o v$. By ßou入cutris is meant, if not one of the Sanhedrim, at least one of the council of the High Priest. See Note on Matth. To $\lambda \mu \boldsymbol{r} \sigma \alpha{ }^{\prime}$, ' having summoned courage.'
44. ¿̇Aúvarev el] Boza and others wrongly render the el by an, as if there were a doubt; whereas el is used with $\theta a v \mu a \zeta^{\prime}(\epsilon t v$, as the Latin si with mirari, (indeed with all verbs of uonder) to express what is not doubted but wondered at: 'Thus we may here render, 'thut he were already dead!', The $\pi \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \alpha a$ is wrongly rendered in $\mathbf{E}$. V. ' long.' Much mistake in the irterpretation of the word might have been avoided by adverting to its primary and leading force. The word, as Valckn. and Lennep say, comes from $\pi \alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \omega$, (or $\pi \alpha \lambda \lambda \infty$ ) to violently shake any thing, and so turn it over. It is a Dative case of the old noun má $\lambda \alpha$, and thus when used of time (to which it was early appropriated) denotes ò xpóvos $\delta \quad \varepsilon \pi l$ áa $\lambda a \iota$, tempus, quod retro est, time which has been thrown back, got rid of, past, whether recently elapsed, or long gone by, in both which significations it occurs in the Classical writers. Thus the Latin olim is from $\delta \lambda_{1 s}$, (and that from $\delta \lambda_{\omega 0}$, volvo) and properly denotes xpóvos $\dot{o}$ (кат') $\delta \lambda \iota \nu$, ( $80 \pi \alpha \lambda \iota \nu$ for $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \pi d \lambda \iota \nu$ ) time which has rolled past and gone. Thus in the words of

Pilate there is a repetition of the foregoing question, with the adoption of a more precise term.
46. $\mu \nu \eta \mu \in i ́ c$ ö ${ }_{\eta \nu} \nu, \& c$.] W olf, Salmas., Krebs, Schleus., and others are mistaken, who take these words to denote a monument constructed of hewn and polished stone, as appears from Matt. xxvii.
 doubt, a cave hewn out in the rock; that being the custom of the country, and of most of the Eastern nations. Many thousands of such $\mu \nu$ e$\mu e i a$ still remain, and are noticed by travellens.

- $\theta$ vigay] Not ' door,' but ' entrance.'

47. evecípovv] 'viewed,' spectabant.

XV1. 1. ס\&ayєvoućvov] 'being elapsed, or past; a sense of the word frequent in the Classical as well as Scriptural writers.

- t रópaбav] Not 'had bought,' but ' bought.' So the Vulg. ' emerunt,' a translation supposed to have been adopted to reconcile this passage with Luke $x$ xiii. 56 . where it is said that the spices were prepared upon the evening of the Sabbath. But, as Mr. Townsend observes, it is only by a scrupulous adherence to the plain sense of Scripture that all difficulties are removed. And the researches of recent. Harmonists and Commentators have established the fact, which had escaped the earlier Commentators, namely, that there were tuo parties of women, to whom the two Evangelists refer respectively. Thus also we are enabled satisfactorily to remove a difficulty which had embarrassed the old Commentators, namely, to reconcile divateinavtos
 ovíns at Joh. xx. 1.
 have been not a little perplexed with this clause,
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because it cannot be referred to what immediately precedes. To remove this difficulty some would take the raj in the sense $\delta \dot{r}$. That, however, is too much of a "device for the nonce." It is better with some Commentators, to suppose that the words have reference not to the clause which immediately preceded, but to the one before that, ais- $\mu \nu \eta \mu \in i o v$; the intermediate words being regadded as parenthetical. Yet the construction at к al $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \beta \lambda$ é $\psi a \sigma a \ell$ will not admit of the parenthesis, and thus the difficulty remains in its full force, and nothing would seem to remove it but to transpose the words, as is done by Newcome and Wakes. But for that there is little authority ; and what may be allowable in forming translaions, is not so in editing the words of an original. I cannot but think that the raj has reference to some clause omitted; not indeed that which Whitey, Grot., and Rosenm. too arbitrarily suppose, 'and this happened luckily for them ;' but to something which may be supplied from both the preceding sentences, thus: And well might they say, who will roll, \&c., and behold, doubtless with surprise, its removal ; for it was very great.' Thus the words at v. 7. ка日cis elev in. are, with Fritz., to be referred, not to the clause which immediately precedes, but to the one before that.

7. lois ma $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ tais a.] Many recent Commentutors understand by this expression Christ's followers in general. But the older ones, (and lately Fritz.) seem right in taking it to denote the Apostles, by a frequent figure of speech, whereby a part is put for the whole, and of which examples are adduced by Grot.

The cal just after is best rendered, 'et (pressertim),' for кal $\mu \Omega \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ;$ a signification often occurring in the Classical writers from Homer downwards. On the reason why Peter is here named the Commentators differ in opinion; though they are agreed that it was not from any
pre-eminence which he had over the rest of the Apostles. The several reasons they assign may perhaps be conjoined. Peter was, it seems, named both for his consolation and assurance, and from the permanent regard which his singular affection towards his master had created.
8. TaX jj ]. This is omitted in most of the best MSS., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets, to Scholz. It was, no doubt, intro duce from Matt. xxviii. 8. The words oúdevt oud en eİov must (as appears from the dфoßoünco just after) be understood of the time during their return, or shortly after, and the persons whom they might then meet with.
9. The authenticity of the remainder of this Gospel has been impugned by several Critics, but defended by more. See a statement of the arguments on both sides in Recens. Synop. To what is there said it may be added, that this passage is satisfactorily defended by Scholz. who, after all his researches, (extended to MSS. nearly half as numerous again as Griesbach's) has never been able to find this portion omitted in more than one MS. (and that, one in which great liberties have been taken) and $a$ single Version.
9. єं Commentators stumble at the $\downarrow$ Tai. But it has no difficulty except to those who adopt Mede's hypothesis with respect to the Demoniacs. Why should not this poor wretch have been possessed with seven devils as well as another was with a legion, i.e. very many.
12. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \dot{c} \rho a \operatorname{\mu o\rho \phi \hat {y}]}$ Some interpret $\mu о \rho \phi \bar{y}$ of dress, the authority for which signification is very slender. Others, more properly, understand by it visage and general appearance. Whatever the alteration in appearance might be, it was such as also to prevent our Lord's being immediately recognised by the two disciples who were going into the country. See Luke xxiv. 18.
 36.
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13. oùdè dкcivoss $\langle$ triarevalal] This seems to be at variance with Luke xxiv. 34 , who says that before they approached, Jesus had appeared to Simon, and that he had related it to the assembly. For even this they did not sufficiently credit; nay even when Jesus had come up, Luke adds, ér $\iota$ ciтьбтойvtco aúrḕv. All this, however, tends to make us repose a firmer confidence in the testimony of those who themselves so slowly and cautiously admitted belief. (Grot.) In the passage of Luke, the Apostles and Disciples are indeed spoken of, but ג'́ $\gamma$ oures does not denote all the Apostles and Disciples gathered together, but only some of them. Passages of this sort, in which what seems spoken of all, is to be understood only of some, are not unfrequent in the N.T. There is therefore no discrepancy between Mark and Luke. Some of the assembly (as Luke tells us) believed that Jesus had returned to life : all the rest denied implicit credit to the narrations concerning that event. Hence even when Jesus appeared to them, they fancied they saw a phantasm; from which we may conclude that they were by no means credulous. (Kuin.)
15. $\pi a ́ \sigma \eta \tau \mathfrak{\eta} \kappa \tau i \sigma c t]$ i.e. to all human creatures, both Jews and Gentiles, to all nations, as Matthew expresses it.
 paring this with the commission given the Apostles, Matt. xxviii. 20. and Luke xxiv. 47, it is plain that not only faith, but repentance and obedience were to be preached in the name of Christ; and consequently that belief is here put for the Christian system in general, a part for the whole. Bajr $\sigma \sigma \theta$ els $\sigma \omega \theta$. signifies, 'he shall by virtue of that faith and baptism be placed in a state of salvation, and, if he continues therein, shall finally attain salvation.' With respect to $\kappa \alpha \tau a n p i \theta$ noeras, whether it be rendered 'damned,' or 'condemned,' matters but little as to the ultimate sense, since upon the lowest meaning that can be affixed to oworjoeral, the contrary cannot but imply a state of present reprobation, which, if continued in, must assuredly end in perdition.
17. $\sigma \eta \mu \in i ̄ a$ dè, \&c.] On the several particulars
of our Lord's promise, so as to show their exact fulfilment much valuable matter may be found in the Commentators ap. Recens. Synop. The exercise of the first gifts (namely the casting out of devils) is proved by the early Fathers, Justin Martyr, Clemens Alex., Origen, Irenæus, Tertullian, \&c. Of the second, namely speaking with new tongues (which must be understood in its full extent, of the miraculous communication of the faculty of speaking with tongues never previously learned) we have abundant evidence. both in Scripture and in the testimonies of the earliest Fathers. The same may be said of the other two particulars, the "taking up serpents." and the "drinking poison without injury." The former (and probably the latter) was in that age regarded as a decisive test of supernatural protection; though we find that this power was sometimes pretended to by impostors. As to the latter, that faculty (as Doddr. observes) would be especially necessary in an age when the art of poisoning was brought to such cursed refinement. As to the fifth particular, healing the sick, the Scriptures and early Ecclesiastical writers are full of examples. Upon the whole, there is full evidence for the fulfilment of those promises which the above expressions, in their plain and full sense, imply, namely, of miraculous attestation to their Divine mission, and supernatural protection under all the evils which they should have to encounter in the exercise of it.
19. $\dot{d} \nu \in \lambda \dot{\eta} \phi \theta_{\eta} \epsilon 1 s \tau \dot{d} \nu$ oن. ] The phrase is found frequently in the Sept. and many other authors adduced by Wets. It is plain from these words that our Saviour ascended in a visible manner, and in the presence of his Disciples; whether (as some say) with thunder and lightning, or involved in a cloud, cannot be determined. "It was (as is justly remarked by Jennings ap. Doddr.) much more proper our Lord should ascend to Heaven in the sight of his Apostles, than that he should rise from the dead in their sight: for his resurrection was proved when they saw him alive after his passion; but they could not see, him in heaven while they continucd upon earth.'
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 many have undertaken to compose a narrative， \＆c．There is a similar commencement to Justin＇s History：＂Cum multi ex Romanis－res Ro－ manas Graco peregrinoque sermone contulissent， \＆c．＂Who are meant by these＂many＂has been much discussed；but it is now agreed that the Gospels of Matthew and Mark could not be intended to be included，the former being from
 bably not yet written．These were，no doubt， the compositions of pious and well－meaning per－ sons，but without the necessary information or qualifications for writing a Gospel History．They were，therefore，not intentionally false，but ne－ cessarily erroneous and defective．It has also been fully established that we are not to under－ stand by these what are called the Apocruphal Gospels，as they have been collected by Fabri－ cius，since few，if any，of those can be proved to have been then in being．It is not surprising that the minds of men，excited as they were by the mighty moral revolution which had taken place，should have been deeply interested about the origin and nature of the new Religion；and that several should have applied themselves to satisfy this rational curiosity，professing indeed to derive their relations from credible，but all of them more or less erroneous and defective，testi－ monies．The compositions in question have perished，though some portions of them may be supposed to have been embodied in the Apocry－ phal Gospels．
＇Етгхeipqбay is considered by most recent Commentators as pleonastic ；though by the antients it was understood to denote attempt as opposed to accomplishment of the purpose．Both of which views seem erroneous．There is no pleonesm；and though failure is not necessarily implied，yet some notion of it is suggested by the employment of a term which alludes to the anduousness of a work executed magno conatu， and is noticed by Hesych．Ayardorocotat has been wrongly taken to signify here to re－arrange what is already uritten．The sense of repetition in the word，though frequent，is not perpetual． Nor need we，with some，suppose that the pre－ position loses its proper force．It is better to take it to denote not only repetition，but succes－
sion，as of one thing after another，which implies setting in order．Thus duarákacoal will be equi－ valent to $\sigma u y+\dot{\alpha} \xi a \sigma \theta a t$ ，and that in a figurative sense may very well denote contexere，componere．
 nifies lst，to carry a full measure，to be full，or make full． 2 dly ，to render fully certain，either as spoken 1．of persons，or 2．（as here and in 2 Tim ． iv．17．）of things，which are thus said to be fully confirmed and established，and are therefore re－ ceived as certain truths．
2．$d \pi^{\prime} \alpha \rho \chi^{\bar{\eta} s]}$ ．This is by some supposed to refer（as $\alpha \nu \omega 0 \theta e \nu$ in the next verse）to the period at which Luke commences his narrative；by others，to the commencement of Christ＇s mi－ nistry；which opinion is greatly preferable；for， among other reasons，aüróxTai would not be very necessary for any events beyond that period． Besides，ürท९éraı being united with aùróx negatives this．
－toù $\lambda$ órou］Many of the best Comment－ ators take this $\mathbf{~ o ~ m e a n ~ ' ~ t h e ~ t h i n g , ~ i . e . ~ t h e ~}$ $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \infty 0 \nu$ in the preceding verse．And ing $\eta$－ pótal roü 入óyou they interpret＇associates in the matter，＇or the thing done，namely，Christ＇s relatives，disciples，friends．Of this sense of入óyos examples are addaced from Acts xiii． 5 15，26． 1 Cor．iv．1．Wisd．vi．4．as also several from the Classical writers．Thus àjтón $\tau a \iota$ will as well as ínтpéraı be referred to $\lambda o ́ y o v$, and we shall have no occasion to supply，as we other－ wise must，$\tau \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \rho a \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ from the subject matter．There is however no necessity to abandon the common interpretation，by which roü $\lambda$ óyou is taken to mean 入óyou roü Өeou，the Gospel；a signification frequent in St．Lulke，and which is confirmed by the high authority of Valckn．in loc．Thus，too，we obtain a more significant expression，and one more agreeable to facts，since Luke received his information，both from those who had attended on the ministry of Cbrist while on earth，and also those who，after his ascension， were pre－eminently ministers for the propagation of his Gospel throughout the world．
 －having diligently investigated every thing from the very first．＇IIapakoдoveєiv signifies properly to follow up，trace，\＆c．Many examples have been adduced from the Classical writers，both
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of the proper and the figurative sense．＂Avco日en cannot mean（as some imagine）＇by inspiration；＇ since the context requires the sense＇from the very first，＇（so $d \pi^{\prime} d \rho \chi{ }^{\eta} 9$ just before）which is of perpetual occurrence，and here has reference to the period at which this Gospel commences （namely，from the conception of John the Bap－ tist）a period beyond that of Matthew and Mark．
－кate $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\mathrm{n}}$ ］This does not so much denote order of time as of events，as to their regular dis－ position，and orderly classification．Өeóфиौe．The notion of some of the older Commentators，that this is only a feigned name expressive of any Christian，and not that of a real person，is dis－ proved by Campb．and others．1．Because it would be the only instance in the N．T．of a feigned name．2．Hecause it would be unsuitable； for if taken（as elsewhere in the N．T．）as a title of excellency，it would be wholly inapplicable；and if as an epithet of affection，фiגтare would have been employed．By 日eó $\phi$ ．is，no doubt，meant a real person；and the epithet кра́тtore cannot well be regarded as one denoting station，other－ wise it would have been omitted at the com－ mencement of the Acts；nor need we advert to any instances of the complimentary use of this or correspondent terms in Latin，since that would be quite unsuitable to the manner of the sacred writers，and unworthy of inspiration．

4．Iva dxiyveis］The eirt is here intensive， and the sense of the verb is to ascertain and be thoroughly informed of any thing．Karnxivivs does not imply what is now meant by Catechetical instruction，but merely denotes that instruction， clementary and chiefly vivd voce，（as is sug－ gested by the primary setse of the word，which is to sound down into the ear）such as preceded and followed up admission into the Christian Church．By $\lambda$ óryon are，I conceive，meant，as the subject of the кarrix．，both the statements made of the facts which had taken place respect－ ing the origin of the new religion，and the doc－ trines which it revealed．It is well remarked by Kuin．，that the Tiv doфdidetav（the certainty） glances at the opposite qualities in the narrations just adverted to，as also do the preceding terms $\dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \theta e \nu, d \kappa \rho \iota \beta \bar{\omega} s$, and $\kappa \alpha \theta e \xi \bar{\eta} s$.

5．eф $\eta \mu \in \rho i a s]$ This word（from exi and

properly a daily service，as that of the Jewish priests in the temple；and since that was daily， and even nightly performed by the priests in turn for a week alternately，it came to denote （as here），by metonymy，the class（and there were 24 classes）who took that weekly service in rotation．This is mentioned，to show that John was of honourable birth．Zacharias was not， however，（as has been supposed）the High Priest ；since tis is added，and the High Priest was of no course at all．His offering of incense was，no doubt，only the daily offering，which would fall to his lot as an ordinary priest in his course．
－Өvyarépwy〕＇posterity．＇A Hebraism．
6．Sinatoi］persons of uprightness and in－
 adjunct imports reality ；for whatever is what it is in the sight of an omniscient God，must be really so．The words following are exegetical and illustrative，and ropevónevor is figuratively used of habit of action；and siкaьópars and dvтo入ais，denoting the ordinances and command－ ments，are nearly synonymous；or the former may （as some suppose）denote the moral，the latter the ceremonial law．＂A $\mu \in \mu \pi$ тоt expresses their good repute with men，as the foregoing epithet did their piety towards God．
7．кa0 $\left.\delta \tau_{1}\right]$＇inasmuch as，＇＇seeing that．＇ $\Pi \rho o \beta e \beta \eta \kappa o ́ \tau \epsilon s$ d $\nu$ rais $\dot{\eta} \mu$ ．This is said to be a Hebraism：but it is only such by the use of $\dot{j} \mu$ epais for $\dot{\eta} \lambda<\kappa i \alpha$, and in the use of $d \nu$ ；the Classical writers（as is shown by the examples adduced by Wets．and Munthe，and especially by those in Recens．Synop．）using the phrase
 The expression exactly corresponds to our elderly and the Greek w $\mu \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\prime} \rho \infty \nu$ ，as Suid．explains xpo－
 case could not exceed 50 ，since after that time a priest was superannuated．

8．lepareúetv］＇discharging the priestly func－ tion．＇The word is only found in the later writers；the earlier ones using lepāo0at．
 $\mu$ épos，which is expressed in Acts i．17．；though perhaps the Accus．may be the $\lambda d$ xos included in the verb．Among the various offices thus dis－ tributed by lot the most honourable was that of burning incense．Tòv vady tov̄ K．，i．e．，the
















Sanctuary，in which was the altar of incense，as distinguished from the temple at large，in which the people were praying，v． 10 ．
 idiom frequent in the Scriptures，but rare in the Classical writers．For roup $\lambda$ aooû $\dot{\eta} \nu$ several MSS． have inv roil $\lambda a o \bar{u}$, which is adopted by almost every Editor from Matth．to Scholz；but wrongly， I conceive，for the authority is too weak to esta－ blish the existence of so great a harshness as the separation of a Genit．so closely connected with its Nomin．as roup $\lambda$ nov with w $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \bar{\eta} \theta$ Os．This harshness，indeed，and the small number of MSS．in favour of the new reading make me suspect that it arose from a mere error of the scribes；who first omitting to v $\lambda a \overline{0} \overline{0}$（which， indeed，would not seem very necessary then， observing the error，inserted the $\bar{\eta} \nu$ after rove גaoĩ．The same kind of mistake has occasioned many thousands of corruptions in the Classical writers．

11．dr dektāv］sail．$\mu e \rho \bar{\omega} y$ ．This was con－ sidered as a good omen by the antients．Such angelic appearances are occasionally mentioned in Scripture，as Judge．xiii．22．and Dan．x． 8.
 lenistic，for which the Classical one is $\mathbf{\ell \pi} เ \boldsymbol{\pi} i \pi$ ． tai rive．

13．elonкov́a日ク］A Hellenistic use of the word，in which the els signifies leaning torcards， which implies favour，\＆c．＇H סén iss $\sigma o v$ ．Some think the prayer adverted to was a prayer for offspring，addressed either then or formerly． Many specious arguments have been urged for， but weighty reasons against，this supposition． Besides that the apparent impossibility of the thing may be supposed to have produced acqui－ escence in the will of God，the pious priest would be unlikely to mingle private concerns with public devotions；and it is therefore more probable that he was praying for the advent of Him whose coming many signs announced to be near at hand，even the Nexslah．

14．＇̇नтat Xapá $\sigma 0 t$ ］Literally，＇he shall be joy to thee，＇ie．occasion of joy；said in allusion
to the name＇I $\omega \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \nu \nu \eta s$ ，which signifies＇the grace and mercy of God．＇＇Aya入入iáts is a still stronger term，and denotes exultation．Fevvioce． Griesb．and others down to Scholz edit，from several MSS．，yepé⿱et，which is，indeed，agree－ able to the proprietas lingua；but of such minu－ tim the sacred writers are little observant．
 papa $\theta$ er，in the sight of the Lord or Jehovah． Though some take K vpiov of Christ，yet Middlet． has shown that the use of the Article with Sup． requires the above sense．
－otvon＿－$i r n$ ．A Nazaritic injunction．So Numb．vi．3．of him who has vowed a vow of
 Eikcpa is derived from the Heb．שכׁר，to inebriate， and denotes generally any intoxicating drink； but was chiefly applied to what we call made wines，or fermented drink，such as ale，or spirit from aniseed，\＆c．The words dx кoillas $\mu \eta t \rho o d s$ abroū contain a Hebrew hyperbole denoting ＇from the earliest period．＇See Is．xviii．8． xix． 1 \＆5．Ps．lxii．6．Yet something very similar occurs in the Anthol．Gree．v．25．The Classical writers use the phrases $i_{k} \pi a t \delta \partial s$ or

 true worship of God，＇as Acts xi．21．xiv． 15. 2 Cor．iii． 16.

17．aúroū］．A difference of opinion exists as to what this is to be referred．Some，as Kuin．， regard it as put emphatically for Christ，and com－ pare Luke v．17． 1 Joh．ii．6．\＆12．But there the reference is not，as here，clear and determinate， the aüroù being closely connected with Kúpiov Tiv Өєóv．Jehovah．The allusion in трoe入єú－ － where see Note．＇Eu，for $\sigma u ́ \nu$ ．Ivé́ $\mu a r ı$ ，dis－ position．$\Delta v \nu a ́ \mu \in i, z e a l$ ，energy，or mighty en－ dowments．On Elias，as a type of the Baptist， see at Matt．xi．14．In dтıनтрé $\psi$ at，\＆c．there is plainly an allusion to MaI．iv．6．（Compare also Ecclus．xlviii．10．）but on the exact import of the words Commentators are not agreed．The most natural mode of interpretation，and that most
${ }_{17}^{\text {17en. 17. } \mu a ́ \sigma a \iota ~ к \nu \rho i ́ \varphi ~ \lambda a o ̀ ̀ ~ к а т є \sigma к є v a \sigma \mu e ́ v o \nu . ~ ' K a i ~ є i ́ \pi e ~ Z a \chi a p i a s ~} 18$















suitable to the words of the Prophet, is to regard them as denoting that reconciliation of discordant sects and political feuds, by a common repentance and reformation, as well as the general cultivation of philanthropy, which it was the purpose of the Gospel to promulgate and enjoin on men. This view is confirmed by the weighty authority of Valckn.
 some difference of opinion as to the sense of these words. Many Commentators (as Campb.) construe them with the words following, and render: • And by the wisdom of the righteous, or of righteousness, to render the disobedient a people well-disposed for the, Lord, furnished for the Lord, or formed for him.' This, however, does violence to the construction of the whole sentence, and therefore it is better, with most Commentators, (supported by the authority of Valckn.) to take the words as a separate and independent clause. Thus èv фponirgec will be for cis $\phi \rho o ́ v \eta \sigma t \nu$. The sense, then, will be, 'to reform the disobedient and unrighteous to the, comprehending and embracing of righteousness.' The true construction seems to be this: кal
 'so that they may be of the disposition of the righteous.'
The sense of èтоцда́\}еı K иріч $\lambda a d \nu$ катебкеvaг $\mu$ évov is, ' to make ready a people prepared and equipped or fitted for (the service of) the the lord.' Thus all is plain. The two first clauses, state the particular purposes of the Baptist's mission (namely, to introduce concord and philanthropy, and reformation of mind and practice). The third states the general purpose, or rather the result of the former.
18. катаं $\tau i]$ Sub. $\sigma \eta \mu$ eiov, which is expressed in a similar passage of Gen. xv. 8 . So also $\dot{v} \nu$ tivi at Judg. vi. 15. and 1 Sam. xxix. 4.
 image borrowed from the custom of Oriental courts.
20. $\check{\epsilon} \sigma \eta-\lambda a \lambda_{i j} \sigma a t$ ] This is not a mere pleonasm, but the latter phrase is meant to explain and strengthen the force of the former. Thus in
 recent Commentators who refer this to the idiom by which the affirmation of a thing is joined with a denial of its contrary, confound two distinct idioms.
$\left.-{ }^{2} \nu \theta^{\prime} \boldsymbol{c}^{\boldsymbol{\omega}} \boldsymbol{\nu}\right]$ 'because.' See Matth. Gr. Gr. $\$ 480$.
21. ìv] ' at, or while.'
22. $\lambda a \lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma a<a \dot{u} \tau o i s]$ i. e. to give them the accustomed benediction, as most Commentators explain; though the thing is not certain. ${ }^{-H \nu}$ סıavé́cov aùroīs, scil. тoûro, i. e. nodding assent to the inquiry whether he had seen a vision. Dtaveúetv signifies to express one's meaning by nods, or becks. See the numerous Classical illustrations of the word which I have adduced in Recens. Synop. Kwods here signifies both deaf and dumb, as may easily be imagined from what has been observed on a former occasion.
23. तeitouprias] Aeitoupyia is derived from the old word $\lambda$ र́ítos, publicus, and signifies properly any public service, whether civil or military. But in the Scriptures it is applied to the public offices of religim; First, that of the Priests and Levites, under the Mosaic Law ; 2dly, that of Christian Ministers of every sort under the Gospel Dispensation.
 $\pi$ тeptéкриßev ėavтìv has been much disputed. It appears, however, that we are not to understand that she concealed her pregnancy, but that she kept herself private; as well to avoid ridicule, as prevent accidents which might endanger the embryo, or impart to it any defilement; (See Judg. xiii. 3.) as also for the purpose of devotion to God for his mercy and goodness in taking away her reproach, which barrenness has always in the East been reckoned to convey. As to the " five months," we need not suppose the first five, nor can we the last five; but rather any five.

 $\theta$ ре́тоts.























25. ėxeiòey] 'looked upon me,' viz. with favour. A signification found in the Hebrew, the elatbeiv of the Greek Classical writers, and the respicere of the Latin. Oveidos is properly a word of middle signification, like the Latin fama, and is in the early writers used in a good sense for dóka, but in the later ones always in a bad sense.
27. $\mu \epsilon \mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \mu \tilde{e} \nu \eta \nu]$ ' betrothed, contracted ;' without which no woman was ever married, among the Jews, and probably the Gentiles also, from the earliest ages. See Hom. Il. Z. 245.
28. кєxapıт ' beloved,' or 'favourite of heaven,' as in Campbell's version. Better (as in the Vulg.) 'gratia plena,' 'highly favoured, or (as Valckn.) 'gratià cumulata.' For (as Valckn. has well observed) all verbs of this form have a sense of heaping up, or rendering full, e. gr. aiцaтóm өаицато́ळ, бтодо́ш, цоибо́ш, катіம். The word xapıtóes is rare, and only found in the Classical writers, once in Liban. It occurs, however, in Fcclus. ix. 8. \& xviii. 17. as also in Ps. xviii. 26.
 quent form of salutation. See Ruth ii, 4. Judg.
 to be a Hebrew form of expressing the superiative; but it is found also in both the Greek and the Latin Classical writers.

form of expression equivalent to,' what these remarkable addresses might mean.'
30. eijpes $\chi$ ápı $\nu$ ] This is not a Hebraism. So
 єüpoyтo tas $\sigma$ тovods. The middle form, however, is always used by the Classics.
31. кa入í $\epsilon \in s$ ] Future for Imperative, Hebraicè et Hellenisticè.
32. $\left.\kappa \lambda \eta \eta_{\eta} \eta_{\sigma \epsilon \tau a l}\right]$ 'shall be.' The Unitarian mistranslation of vids i廿iotov, ' a son of the most high God,' is completely refuted by Middlet. in loc. On the things expressed in this and the next verse, see Grot. and Whitby.

 signifies, 1 . to overshadow; 2. to surround ; 3. to defend, or to assist ; 4. as here, to exert a power or influence in, like $\boldsymbol{i}^{2}$ гокijvow in 2 Cor . xii. 9 .
36. rijpet] This (for $\gamma \dot{\eta} \rho a$ ) is found in almost all the best MSS. and the Ed. Princ., and other early Edd. and is adopted by Wets., Matth., Griesh., Tittm., Vater, and Scholz. It is besides confirmed by the use of the Sept.

- äктos doriv-oreifa] On this idiom I have fully treated in Recens. Synop. and on Thucyd. i. 13. \& iii.2. See also Matth. Gr. Gr. § 390 . C.

37. oі́к $\left.\dot{\alpha} \delta \nu \nu a \tau \eta \dot{\sigma} \epsilon \_-\dot{\eta} \bar{\mu} \alpha\right]$ This is, as 1 observed in Recens. Synop., a proverbial form of expression similar to one in Gen. xviii. 14.


















 like the Heb. רבד, signifies thing, as often. The Future here has the force of the Present.
38. idov-кvpiov] An expression of pious acquiescence.
 time.' IIolıv'Iouda. The name of the city or town the Evangelist has not recorded; but those Commentators who are unwilling to be supposed ignorant of any thing unknown try to find it out. Jerusalem, which some propose, cannot be thought of; and Hebron, in which most acquiesce, would, as being the capital city of the tribe, have required the Article to have been prefixed to tóiıv. Others, very probably, conjecture that the true reading is Ioútra or Ioúra, a town of Judah mentioned in Josh. xv. 55. \& xxi. 16.; which name might easily have been, by the time of our Lord, softened into 'Iovida. There is not, however, the slightest authority for this conjecture, in either MSS. or Versions.
 perly signifies to bound, like young animals; but is sometimes, like sulire in Latin applied to denote the leaping of the foetus in utero. So
 and Nonn. Dionys. viii. 224. This is not uncommon in the advanced stages of pregnancy, and is usually occasioned by sudden perturbation.
 rove. This manner of speaking (which, Rosenm. observes, is a form expressive of admiration at any unexpected honour done) not unfrequently occurs in the Classical writers.
39. è $\sigma \kappa i \rho \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$ हो $d \gamma^{2} \lambda \lambda$.] i.e. as it were leaped for joy; for the foetus was incapable of any sensation. This manner of speaking is common, especially in the popular phraseology of every language. Her knowledge that Mary was
to be the mother of the Messiah, as well as ber immediate belief in the promise of the angel, seems to have been imparted by a Divine revela-

 which is edited by Matth., Griest., and Scholz ; but wrongly; for the reading seems to have arisen merely from an accidental omission of ev $d \gamma a \lambda \lambda$. , (which is awkwardly interposed between the Nominat., and the verb) and then to have been inserted, but in the wrong place. Besides, the reading in question involves, in év $\boldsymbol{d} \boldsymbol{j} \boldsymbol{y} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \lambda$. iv $\tau \bar{j}$ кoul., a greater irregularity than can be found any where else in St. Luke's writings.
 closely with wiar. But this construction, though sanctioned by the usage of Scripture, pares down the sense. That proposed by Kuin. is unnecessarily tortuous.
40. It is observable, that most of the phrases in this admirable effusion are borrowed from the O.T., especially from the song of Hannah, to which it bears a strong resemblance, and in which there were so many passages remarkably suitable to her own case. See more in Grot., Doddr., Rosenm., and Jebb's Sacred Lit. p. 110 \& 392.
 is not a mere Hebraism, but is very emphatic, and implies the greatest earnestness and intensity of feeling. Mcya入úvect, in this precatory use (of which there are instances in the Classical writers) signifies to extol. Taxeivcoolv signifies not humility, but lowly condition, as in Gen. xxix. 32. and elsewhere; though the former may be included as a secondary sense.
41. $\mu$ акарьoüбt ' 'shall esteem me happy.' In this absolute use the word occurs in James v.11.; but in the Classical writers it is usually accompanied with a Genitive of thing, stating the cause, or origin.
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49．Meya入eis］The Commentators supply Sora，or x $\rho \alpha \dot{\gamma} \mu a \tau a$ ．But it should rather seem that $\mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha \lambda \epsilon i o \nu$ is a substantive，though derived from the adject．Meyaneios．And so Euthym． evidently took it．
 syntax not unfrequent in the LXX．
51．Mary proceeds to celebrate God＇s power， and having laid down the general position impinge кра́тos iv Bpaxiov aivoū，（where the Aorist denotes custom）illustrates it by examples． Beaxiont denotes，by a usual Hebrew figure，the mighty power of God．The use，too，of moreì throughout the passage is Hebraic．Dteckóp－ Trier，＇he utterly discomfits．＇A metaphor derived from putting to flight a defeated enemy． The word not unfrequently occurs in the LXX．， （and，in this very sense，in Ps．lvii．11．）but very rarely in the Classical writers，though one example is adduced by Kuin．from mElian Var．


 cent Commentators render，＇the proud，as to the imaginations of their hearts．＇But there is no reason to deviate from our common version． $\Delta$ lavolta is governed of $\dot{e} \pi l$ understood，and may be understood to denote their thoughts and devices．There may，however，be a sort of hy－ pallage ；and Campb．has not ill rendered，＇he dispelleth the vain imaginations of the proud．＇ See a fine paraphrase by Norris，cited in Recens． Synop．

52．ка日eì̀e dvעácтas］Käaipo signifies pro－ pertly to pull down，as applied to things；but it is not infrequently used of persons．The pas－ sage is taken from Ecclus．x．14．See my Notes on Thucyd．vi．83．The duyd́⿱宀八九木 may denote not Kings only，but all who are invested with poi－
tical power；of which signification 1 have ad－ duce examples in Recess．Synop．

53．The sentiment in the foregoing verse is again brought forward，but here changed from kings to rulers，to the powerful in general． Пeivëvtas expresses the same as taxeivois in
 ing of the simplicity of common life and Oriental plainness，denoting the subsidia vita．
 properly＇to lay hold of any thing，＇or person，by the hand，in order to support it when it is likely to fall；but it is here，as often in the Classical writers，used metaphorically，for＇to protect，＇
 v．72．and frequently elsewhere．The construe－ sion will be plain from the punctuation which $I$ have adopted，and it is confirmed by Ps．xcvii．3． LXX．With respect to the full sense of $\mu \nu \eta \sigma \theta \hat{\eta}$－ vat，（as I explained in Recens．Synop．）Good is said to be mindful of his people，when he exerts his power for their support，and confers the be－ nefits he promised．

56．шंбєl $\mu \bar{\eta} \nu a s$ speiss］i．e．，as the best Com－ mentators think，till very near the time of Eliza－ beth＇s delivery．That she left her at so critical a time was probably from motives of delicacy， since such were periods of extraordinary resort of company．

 to call it．＇A frequent sense of the Imperfect． See Wider＇s Gr．Gr．
 This paragogic form of out is intensive，signifying nay，by no means．So Luke xii．51．xiii．3．\＆5． xvi． 30 ．

62．evévevov］＇they intimated by becks and signs．＇See Note supra v．22．At to $\tau i$ sub．
bsupr.














кaтa, as to. It is not necessary, however, to take the $\tau \boldsymbol{d}$ for roũro. It belongs to the whole of the clause following ; nor is there any pleonasm of the word, as some imagine.
63. Ttvaciotov.] This is supposed to mean the small square writing board whitened over, which is even yet in use in the East. Aé $\gamma \omega 0$, 'expressing.' A sense occurring also in the Classical writers, and derived from the unexact phraseology of common life.
64. dveఱ́ $\chi^{\theta \eta-\gamma \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \sigma a}$ a.] This is by most Commentators referred to one of those idioms, usual in the best writers, by which a verb is joined to two nouns of cognate sense, to one only of which it is properly applicable. So Hom. airov каl olvov éסóvyes. and 1 Cor. iii. 2. $\Gamma \alpha \lambda \alpha \dot{\nu} \mu \bar{\varepsilon} s$ غтótı
 Besides, the word $d$ voí $e \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$ may not inaptly be applied to setting free the tongue. Thus (as De Rhoer observes) Sophocles and Themistius speak of the tongue being shut, and of the door of the tongue. Now surely there is no more impropriety in speaking of the tongue being opened. Moreover, the Heb. פת, to which avoiरciv answers, signifies not only to open, but to loose, as in Gen. xxiv. 32. Is. v. 27. See the Note on Mark vii. 34. And so Euthym. must have taken the word. The genius of modern languages does not indeed admit this idiom. We may therefore translate, 'and immediately his mouth was opened, and his tongue loosed.'

I have in Recens. Synop. shown that the hypothesis by which the loss and recovery of his speech is attributed to natural causes cannot be admitted, because we learn from the Evangelist that it was a judicial infliction. The presumption as well as folly of making this, in common with many other narrations of the N. T., a mere myth, cannot be too severely reprobated.
65. фóßos] This imports a mixed feeling of wonder and awe.

 rare in the Classical writers. Very similar is the
 the Latin reponere, or condere mente. The $\tau i$, which is for ris, expresses admiration; and the
$\dot{\alpha} \rho a$ is ratiocinative. Render, 'What sort of man now will this child become?'

- кal Xelp Kupíou $\dot{\eta} \nu$ цeт' aìtoū] These words are by some supposed to be a part of the speech; by others, an observation of the Erangelist; which is undoubtedly the true way of taking the passage, being highly suitable to the context, and such as alone the construction will bear. The кal is not for $y$ do, as some suppose; but signifies et sanè, and indeed.

67. троєф tors think that the term here, and occasionally elsewhere, only denotes to praise God in fervent and exalted strains, like those of a prophet. And indeed such a sense in $\pi \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \eta$ is found in the Classical writers; but not in the Scriptural ones; much less in $\pi \rho \circ \phi \eta \tau \in \dot{e} \in i v$. It may indeed be with truth affirmed, that in the N.T. at least there are but two significations of xpoф $\eta$ revécu; 1. to prophecy, predict future events; the other, to speak under the impulse of divine inspiration. Now the hymn of Zacharias is both inspired and prophetical.
68. dтєєкéчaco] scil. ròv 入aóv, 'hath visited with his mercy and favour.' The metaphor (which occurs also in ver. 78. and vii. 16. Acts xv. 14. Hebr. ii. 6.) is derived either, as is commonly supposed, from the custom of princes of visiting the provinces of their kingdom, to redress grievances and confer benefits; or rather from the visiting, of the distressed by the benevolent. Zacharias's language was permitted by the Spirit to be accommodated to the opinion of the speaker, and, at that time, of all Jews, who supposed the Messiah was to be manifested for the deliverance and benefit of the Jews only, not to be a blessing to the whole human race.
69. ќ́pas $\sigma \omega \tau \eta$ fias] On the exact nature of the metaphor Commentators are not agreed. The following are the only ones which have any semblance of truth. 1. Noesselt supposes an allusion to the iron horns which were sometimes fastened to the helmets of the antients. This, however, is too far-fetched. 2. Fischer and many others regard the metaphor as derived from the four horns of the altar, which were among the He brews (as the ara and foci among the Greeks and Romans) places of refuge for suppliants.














Thus Christ will be regarded as a new refuge of safety to those who embrace his religion. This, however, seems rather ingenious than solid. Far more natural is the common interpretation (adopted by the antients and most moderns, and ably supported by Kuin.) which derives the metaphor from horned animals, whose strength is in their horns. Hence horn is a term perpetually used to denote strength, and is thus a symbol of power and principality. Thus кépas
 $\rho \delta v$, a royal and powerful deliverer and helper.
 бato, 'effected deliverance.'
70. ar' alwyos」. This phrase, which often occurs in the Hellenistic writers, and sometimes in the Classical ones, (who, however, prefer ${ }^{d} \pi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \dot{d}, \chi \bar{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ ), imports, 'from the most antient times.'
71. $\sigma \infty$ Tnpiav] i.e. a means of salvation, for oworipa; a frequent idiom in the Hellenistical writers. ' $\mathrm{B} \xi$ is for $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$, as often.
 The sense is: 'in order to show his mercy and kindness to' \&c.; for the phrase does not imply
 corresponds to the Heb. עש in Genes. xxi. 23. and signifies to deal mercifully and kindly with, to exercise kindness to,' as Acts xv. 4. and Luke $x .37$.
 syntax cannot be removed by resorting to the principal of apposition; nor even by supposing the antecedent as put in the same case with the relative, because that does violence to the construction; but rather by supplying кaтa, with Camer. and others. Thus the sense will be, 'by (i. e. confirmed by) the oath,' \&c.
74. тoù ठoūval] Sub. xepl, or take it for $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ tệ doüvat, Hellenistice. This and the next v. contain the substance of the oath unto Abraham, on which see Recens. Synop. The Prophets of the $O .1$., in describing the times of the Messiah, and the spiritual worship which was to succeed to the ceremonial observances of the Law, use the very same language as this Divine Hymn, though neither the Jews, nor even the prophets themselves, understood those prophecies as we, informed by History and enlightened by the

Gospel, are enabled to do. 'Aфó $\beta$ oos must be taken not with puodévias, but with $\lambda a \tau p \in \dot{e} \epsilon \iota \nu$, which is required by the construction, and yields a sense most in unison with the nature of the Gospel. 'Oqióvntı denotes the observances rendered to God; dixacooivn, the duties to men. Compare Eph. iv. 24. T $\bar{n}$ s Ycons is omitted in many of the best MSS., all the most important Versions, and some Fathers, and is cancelled by Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz ; and rightly, 1 conceive; for we cannot imagine why it should have been omitted, but easily why it should have been inserted.
 owetnpias. This, under the Law, was by legal righteousness ; under the Gospel, by remission of sins.
78. ठıà $\sigma \pi \lambda \dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi \nu a]$ A Hebrew metaphor (on which see Note on Matth. ix. 36.) more significant than $\begin{aligned} & \lambda \text { eos. }\end{aligned}$
 of this phrase there has been some diversity of opinion. Many eminent Commentators take dyavo入i to signify a budding branch, and figuratively a son, like the Heb. But the metaphor is so harsh, and leads to such a confusion, taken in conjunction with the words following, that I see no reason to abandon the common interpretation, 'the dawn from on high,' with allusion to those passages of the 0 . T.' which describe the Messiah under the metaphor of the light and the sun. See Mal. iv. 2. To this interpretation, indeed, it is objected by Wets. and others, that thus $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi$ úsous will not be proper, because the sun when he ascends is always in the horizon, and not over head. This criticism, however, proceeds on the error of trying popular language by the rules of strict philosophical propriety. The expression may very well denote that moderate elevation which the Sun soon at-
 with Kuin., Tittm., and Wahl, for $\alpha{ }_{\nu} \nu \omega \theta e v$, i. e. from heaven. So Virgil: "Jam nova progenies coelo dimittitur alto. ${ }^{\text {P }}$ The terms which follow all require the interpretation in question. The whole passage represents the Messiah as coming. like the rising sun, to dispel the darkness which covered the world, bringing life and immortality to light through his Gospel.


 'I $\sigma \rho a \eta{ }^{\prime} \lambda$.










79. The same metaphor is continued. Compare Ps. xliii. 3. \& cxix. 105. and on elf bodd Beß, Eurip. Med. 740. and Fsch. Ag. $^{170}$.
80. $\pi \nu \in e^{\mu} \mu a \tau \iota$ ! ' in mind,' and wisdom, as opposed to bodily growth.

- edv rais $\dot{\rho \rho j \mu o s] ~ W h e t h e r ~ b y ~ t h i s ~ i s ~ m e a n t ~}$ the Hill country where he was born, or the Desert properly so called, the Commentators are not agreed. The latter may be considered pretty certain. The period of his retirement is with probability supposed to have been at the ape of puberty, when he would have strength of body and mind to bear that solitude, which for him was so necessary. For thus he would not be warped by the prejuices of the Jewish teachers, and would, in that seclusion, approach near unto God, and seek that guidance of the Holy Spirit which, was neecessary to enable him to be the Herald of the Gospel.
- devodeileces] The word is often used of admission to any office unto which a person has been appointed; and here denotes 'entrance on his minstry;' as $x .1$. and Acts $i .24$.
II. 1. ì тaĩ $\grave{\eta} \mu \dot{\rho} \rho a t s$ ixeivars] This does not refer to the last verse, but to ver. 36 . seqq.
 edict or decree was issued, or promulgated. This sense of d $\xi_{i j p} \chi$ Eftat occurs in the LXX. at Dan. ii. 13. ix. 25 . and Esth. i. 19., where it answers to the Heb. सr. This use of neuter for passive is frequent in ali writers. $\Delta \dot{o} \gamma \mu a$ in this sense occurs both in Hellenistic and Classical Greek.
 Gr. Gr. $\$ 38.3$., takes $d \pi o \gamma \rho$. to be in apposition with the preceding. But it is better to suppose an ellipsis of $\dot{\omega} \sigma \tau e$, (i.e. els $\tau \mathrm{d}$ ) in the sense of purpose, of which examples are frequent. By $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ o $T_{\kappa}$, scil. $\gamma \bar{\eta} \nu$, it is now generally admitted, cannot be meant the whole world. But there are two other significations of the expression, in chusing between which the Commentators are not agreed. Most of the Commentators take it to mean the Roman world, i.e. empire; this expression (like orbis terrarum in Latin) being then in general use. See Acts xxiv. 5. Apoc. iii. 10. xvi. 14. As, however, no Historian notices such a general census of the whole empire,
and as it is improbable that, had there been one, it would have been mentioned in connexion with the Propretor of Syria, we may rather suppose, with Keuchen, Bynæus, Wolf, Lardner, Pearce, Fischer, Rosenm., Kuin., and others, that Judea only is meant, as in Acts xi. 28. and Luke iv. 3. and perhaps $\times x i .20$. Indeed the Jews called Judæa the earth of all the earth. See Ruth. i. 1. 2 Sam. xxiv. 8, and Rose's Parkh. in v.
As to the sense of $\alpha \pi o \gamma \rho a \dot{\phi} e^{\circ} \theta a t$, which is rendered in E. V. 'tuxed,' we have the testimony of Josephus that no tax was levied from Judea till many years after this period, and the use of the word will authorize us to adopt the interpretation of almost all modern Commentators, 're-
 census of the population. Of this many examples are adduced by Wets., and others are added in Recens: Synop., to which I must also refer for information on the next verse as concerns $\alpha \ddot{T} T \eta$
 sion of which the limits of this work will not permit me to enter. The reader is likewise referred to Townsend Chr. Arr. i. 51.

4. ¿そ öкоч кal zarpiās $\Delta$.] Grot., Kypke, and others, have rightly observed, that the тaтpıa was a part of the oikos, the latter comprehending the collateral branches, and even servants (olkoyeveis), the former being confined to the direct line of descent; very similar to the distinction among the Romans, of gentes and familia. After the many separations which had taken place of the Jews, any such census as the above would have been impossible, unless each went to the place which had formerly been the lot of his clan or family. The only reason for Mary's attendance, the Commentators imagine, is that she was an heiress; for otherwise women were not registered. But it does not follow from the words of the Evangelist that Mary went to be registered; for oiv may very well mean'accompanied by.'
5. $\mu е \mu \nu \eta \sigma т e \cup \mu e ́ \nu \eta] ~ ' w h o ~ h a d ~ b e e n ~ b e t r o t h e d ~$ (and was then married).' That such must be the sense, appears from Matt. i. 25.
6. $亠 \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \eta \sigma a \nu$ ai $\dot{\eta} \mu$.] Simil. Gen. xxv. 24.
 à̇тì. ' $\mathrm{H} \mu$. is here put for time; which use is











frequent in Scripture，and is called a Hebraism； but it occurs in Thucyd．vi．65．al $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\rho} \rho a t$ èv ais

 occurs in the Classical writers，though $\sigma \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho-$ rayon often does．We find it，however，in Ezra xvi．4．These $\sigma \pi \alpha{ }^{\prime} \rho \gamma a \nu a$ were not only in use then，but even until very late in modern times， as a preventive to distortion．
 have shown in Recens．Synop．）is often used absolutely，the place of laying being supplied from the context or the subject．Here it is a voa signata de $h$ ．re，and may be rendered＇cradled．＇ It is not so easy to fix the sense of $\phi \dot{\alpha} \tau \nu \eta$ ，which is commonly taken to denote＇a manger．＇But although such would seem no unfit receptacle for a new born child，yet，as mangers are not，now at least，in use in the East，but hair cloth bags in－ stead，and as customs rarely change in that quar－ ter，this interpretation has been thought untenable． Yet it has never been established that mangers were not used by the antients，nay there has been tolerable proof adduced from Homer and Hero－ dotes that they were，namely，such as our cribs． See Is．xxxix．9．and Job xxxix．9．The com－ mon interpretation，however，seems to be unten－ able on another and more serious ground．For if the фárvy（as Wets．observes）was a part of the stable，and the stable a part of the inn；it follows that he who had room in the stable，had room in the inn．Therefore，by saying that there was no room for them in the inn，the Evangelist indicates that the stable was unconnected with the inn．It is（as Middlet．observes）plain from the whole context that the $\phi \dot{\alpha} \tau \nu \eta$ was not merely the place in which the babe was laid，but the place also in which he was born and swaddled． The words $\dot{\dot{\varepsilon}} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ ，фáтvy surely belong as much
 the delivery take place？Not in the каталица， for there there was no room not merely for the child，but for＂them．＂．It is plain therefore that we must adopt the interpretation of Wets．， Rosenm．，Middlet．，Kuin．，and many others，who by фá vp understand some place of lodging， though less convenient than the кaтa入v pa． Many think it was an enclosed space paled in， like our farm yards；which is，indeed，very agreeable to the sense of the word．Such，how－ ever，would be but indifferent shelter for one in Mary＇s situation，and therefore others（and amongst these Valckn．）prefer the signification
＇a stall，＇or＇stable，＇which latter sense is con－ firmed by the authority of many of the early Fathers，who call the place of Christ＇s nativity a cave．If so，the stable in question would be a natural stable．Those writers，however，distin－ guish between the cave and the ф́qup．It is， 1 think，plain that they took $\phi \dot{\alpha} \tau \nu \eta$ to mean a crib，and equally so that they read iv $\phi \dot{\alpha} \tau \nu \eta$ ， which is found in many antient MSS．And such，after all，may be the true reading and sense． Thus though the place be not mentioned，yet it may be implied to have been the stable，by the mention of the usual appendage to a stable， namely，a crib．On the Jewish ката入úmaта， see Camp．or Recent．Synop．
8．aypau入oüvere］The plain sense here is ＇abiding in the fields．＇The word properly sig－ nifies to abide in the fields sub do，whether by night or day，which latter is required to be either expressed，as here，or implied in the con－ text．It is not certain，however，that they abode in the open air．They might be in tents；for Kypke cites from Died．Sic．aypaudiots，to denote a military encampment．Фu入்́テनov res фu入aкas may be rendered＇keeping the watches．＇
 come upon the sight suddenly，and，as appears from the examples in Wets．，is especially used of supernatural appearances．$\Delta o ́ \xi a$ Kupiov．Very many recent Commentators explain this＇a bright glory or splendour，＇by a well known idiom al－ lading to the name of the Deity．But it is better， with Euthym．，Whity，Schoetg．，and Dahl，to take it here，and at Acts vii．55．，（as also in Exod．xxiv．16．xl．34． 1 Kings viii．11． 2 Chr． vii．1．Heb．כבד זהוה）of that Өeiov wis，or ex－ treme splendour，in which the Deity is repre－ sented as appearing to men，and sometimes called the Schechinah，an appearance frequently at－ tended，as in this case，by a company of angels．
10．$\chi$ apàv］By metonymy，for＇cause of joy，＇ as James i．2．and Aristoph．Plat．637．入érecs $\mu 0 t$ aa pd $\nu$ ．

11．© $\omega$ ．i nj ］Wets．has here and on i．79．in－ contestably proved，（after Bp．Pearson），by a vast assemblage of citations，that the terms
 applied in Scripture to Christ，prove him to have been of an origin far more august than the human，and to be only applicable to a Deus prasens，The Son of God，and God．Eúpios here is for $\theta$ eds，and corresponds to the Heb． Jehovah．
 Apec. A .11.











12. $\tau \bar{\eta} \phi a r \nu \eta]$ The $\tau \hat{\eta}$ is not found in very many of the best MSS., nor in the Ed. Princ. and other early Edd., and has been with reason cancelled by the Editors from Wets. to Scholz. It has been shown by Middlet. that the Article can here have no place.
 'the angel was attended by .' $\Sigma \tau \rho a \tau t a ̄ s o u ̀ \rho$. Called by the Hebrews the hosts of Heaven.
14. év ú廿ioroıs] Sub. either tónots, scil. oupavois, (the plural being used with reference to the Heb. םיש, which only occurs in the plural), or rather oupayois, required by the dogma of Jewish Theology, which reckoned three heavens, the aerial, the starry, and the highest, or the seat of God and the angels. The phrase occurs also in Matt. xxi. 9. Mark xi. 10. Luke xix. 38. Job xvi. 19.

- $\Delta \dot{o} \xi \alpha$ - $\dot{i} \delta o \kappa l a]$ There are few sentences so short with which Commentators have been more perplexed, in determining the sense, than this. Hence some would read evionias, and others conjecture cidokia. But the former seems to be merely an antient conjecture, and is as little to be attended to as the latter, which is professedly such. Just as little notice is due to those who change the dosology into a kind of proverb, by taking eidoxla $\epsilon \nu$ a $\nu \theta$ pónots as the predicate, and the rest of the words as the subject of the sentence. Various methods of interpretation have been propounded by Commentators of the last half century, all liable more or less to objection. In this strait a very recent English Commentator comes to our aid, and proposes to extricate us by a simple expedient. "The whole difficulty (says he) seems to have arisen from dividing the verse into three clauses. That it consists only of two is evident to demonstration from the apposition of $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{v} \dot{\psi} \boldsymbol{\prime} \sigma$ тous and $\theta \in \varphi \bar{\varphi}$ in
 other. Hence also the following order: Beā ad
 $\gamma^{\eta}{ }^{\text {s. }}$ eipriv, evidokia." But so, far from this being 'evident to demonstration,' the sentence, even after it has been put on the bed of Procrastes, still remains (mirabile dictu) the same, i.e. trimembris; for at eidooia must necessarily be repeated $\langle\sigma \tau \iota$; and $\dot{\nu} \dot{d} \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\omega} \pi$ ors must also be
repeated, otherwise there is no sense. Besides, the order here proposed does violence to the plain structure of the sentence, and that by the above mentioned unnatural procedure. The "apposition" supposed is not such, but an antithetical apodosis. The sentence, I repeat, is grammatically, trimembris. For though some eminent Commentators recognize only tro members and a corollary, that is conceding the point in dispute, the corollary clause constituting a third. That indeed is in some measure exegetical of the preceding; $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ d $\nu \theta$ Pósous corresponding to
 the first member), and evidokia to elpripn. At the second member $\theta \in \bar{\omega}$ must be supplied from the first, and be taken for $\pi \rho d s$ т $\delta \nu$ Өeóv. It must also be supplied in the third from the second. Ruiooria signifies a state of acceptance. The omission of the copula before the clause in d $\nu \theta 0$ ójoors eid. may be accounted for on the principle suggested by Doddr., namely, that such exclamatory sentences are usually broken up into short elliptic clauses. It should seem, however, that evidooia is in apposition with and explanatory of $k \pi l \gamma^{n} s$ elp $\eta \nu \eta$. Thus the sentence is grammatically trimembris, but in sense bimembris. In such cases of apposition ${ }^{\circ}$ हैनTt is understood, and thus no copula is necessary. It is plain that we must supply in the two last clauses not ế $\sigma \tau \omega$, as many do ; but évтt. The 2 d and 3d clauses assign the cause and ground of

 кal is, as often, redundant, after the manner of the Heb. . As to the next words, there is no pleonasm, as the Commentators suppose; for the use of the Article before each word forbids us to take it as the common idiom d $\downarrow \boldsymbol{\theta}$ pworos $\mu a ́ \nu \tau t s$; but the latter term is in apposition with, and exegetical of the former; q. d. the men, i. e. the shepherds.
- $\tau \dot{d} \dot{\rho} \dot{\eta} \mu a]$ The Commentators here take $\dot{\rho} \eta \bar{\mu} \alpha$ for $\pi \rho \bar{a} \gamma \mu a$, as in several other passages; And so the Heb. Tבב, and the Greek Classical zros and $\lambda$ óros. There is, however, generally a sort of significatio pragnans, the word denoting a thing spoken of. Here $\tau \dot{d}$ reyouds is added by way of explanation.
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19．auverpipet］＇kept them in mind，＇＇kept her mind intent on the consideration of them．＇
 ing to comprehend．＇But the proof is imperfect， the endeavour being introduced ad libitum．It is better，with Elan．，to take it to mean＇forming conjectures respecting，＇ie．by comparing past with present events．But far more natural and agreeable to the construction is the common interpretation，（in which Valckn．finally ac－ quiesces），＇pondering，revolving，＇тарє $彑 \in \tau$＇ ova，（so Euthym．explains，）as in very many passages of the Classical writers．So oitanoyi－ ̧eotas iv tais кapoíass in Mark ii．6．and Luke v．22．＇Er тй карס́sâ belongs to both ouvetripet and $\sigma u \mu \beta \dot{\lambda} \lambda \dot{\lambda}{ }^{2} v \sigma a$ ．So Dan．vii．28．кal td


20．ن்же́नт is found in almost all the MSS．and early Fd． confirmed by numerous passages from this Gospel and the Acts．And it is adopted by every Critical Editor from Wets．to Scholz．

21．aúrdv］This（for the common reading $\tau \delta$ ration）is found in almost all the best MSS． and Versions，with the Ed．Prince．and other early Edd．It is adopted by Math．，Griesb．， Tittm．，Vat．，and Scholz．The common reading is plainly a correction．

22．Пapaotīбat］The term is here used кат＇ ikoxiv，of victims brought to the altar，and offerings consecrated to God，as the Heb．הממדב， and the Latin admovere and sistere．The verb axdycuy is generally used of sacrifices．

25．Jixasos cal cùaßウjs］The former of these
terms implies a strict observance of the external ceremonies of the Law ；the latter，a spirit of devout reverence towards God．Eúdaßìs pro－ perly denotes（as I observed in Recens．Synop．） ＇one who handles a thing cautiously，＇and by me－ taphor，＇one who is cautious and circumspect，＇ especially in his conduct towards God．
－тapdк $\lambda_{\eta \sigma \iota \nu} \tau$ ．＇I．］i．e．by metonymy of abstract for concrete，the consoler，afaik $\lambda_{\eta}$－ roy，a name，by the Jews of that age and long afterwards，used to designate the expected Mes－ shah，with reference to the language of the Pro－ phets，which would be brought peculiarly to heart by the oppression under which they were then groaning from the Gentiles．$\Pi \nu \in \bar{v} \mu \alpha d \gamma_{\text {，}}$ ，i．e． ＇the influence of the Holy Spirit．＇See Middlet．
 is edited by Math．，Griesb．，Vat．，and Scholz．
 ion would be éxpпиатьஎдévos ind той $\Pi \nu .$, as in Math．ii．12．Acts x．22．，and elsewhere． $\mathbf{X}_{\rho \eta \mu \alpha \tau i \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu}$ signifies to give a $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \mu \alpha$ ，（antiently synonymous with $\chi \rho \eta \sigma \mu \delta s$ ），i．e．an oracular and Divine admonition．In what manner this $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \mu a$ was in the present case conveyed，whether by oral communication，dream，or otherwise，cannot with certainty be determined．＇Iסeīv $\theta$ ávarov．A Hebraism answering to ראות מית．It never occurs in the Classical writers；though di dy líeiv and ciocieiv are cited from the Poets．

27．$\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \pi \nu$ ．］＇under the influence of the Spirit．＇＇Ep，like the Heb．$工$ ，by，is often synony－ mons with $\delta t \alpha$ ，denoting the moving cause．Td











which, like dıкаiwa, denoted the rites of the Lav.

## 28. кal aürds] ' He too.'

 ' to loose, let go away from any place (or figuratively from any state which implies coercion) to any other place,' as home, \&c.; and it is used either with els Tiv olkiay, or absolutely; and sometimes, as here, it is employed figuratively, and by euphemism, of death, with the addition of тoù $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s$, or of $\tau o \bar{u} ' \zeta \tilde{\eta} \nu$, as is usual in the Classical writers, though in the Scriptural ones without it, as here and in Num. xx. 29. and Gen. xv. 2. See many examples and similar sentiments cited in Recens. Synop. The sense of the passage is ' Now, Lord, thou dost (by this sight) dismiss me to the grave as thou promisedst, in peace and tranquillity, because my eyes have seen my salvation,' i.e. the author of it. There is no occasion to suppose, with many, that $d \pi o \lambda$ úcs is for $d$ dodo voess. The aged saint, by a beautiful figure, takes this sight of his Re deemer as $a$ dismisal from the burden of life, a sort of $G o$ in peace. It is strange so many Commentators should have failed to see that $\bar{\partial} \tau \iota$ after dy elpriv is to be closely connected therewith, and rendered not 'for' but 'because.' Now this construction is common when a verb or adjective precedes; why, then, should it not be allowed after an adjectival phrase? The other signification 'for,' requires much unauthorized subaudition to make out any construction, as may be seen by consulting the Paraphrasts. Deazótns is in Scripture used of the supreme Lord, i.e. God; but in the Classical writers the highest sense it has is when used of Sovereigns.
30, aidov ol $\delta \phi \theta$.] In oi $\delta \phi \theta$. there is an emphasis, as in Gen. xlv. 11. and elsewhere. To Gwotripoov, Neut. adjective for substantive, as in Luke ii. 30. Eph. iii. 6. Ps. xcviii. 2. See Matth. Gr. Gr. 6827.
32. $\phi \bar{\omega} \bar{s}-\dot{\varepsilon} \theta \nu \bar{\omega} \nu]$ This is an apposition with To $\sigma \omega T$ tipsov $\sigma o \nu$ at ver. 30. Grot. observes that the passage has reference to Is. xlix. 6. and Ps. xcviii. 2., from which it appears that there is here a transposition, for $\phi \bar{\omega} \mathrm{s} \dot{d} \theta \omega \bar{\omega}$, eis $d \pi$ oкd$\lambda u \psi$,u. But eis dंток. does not, I conceive, mean (as Grot. and others suppose, 'for a revelation of the righteousness of God;' but is best ex-


 move any thing that covers an object.
33. iv] ' per syncopen, for ग̄ $\sigma a y$, Dorice,', say the Commentators. It was not, however, peculiar to the Doric. It was a very antient usage, but could not well arise from Syncope; though it was caught up, together with many syncopated words, by the Poets, to suit their convenience. I suspect it to have been a very old form, as old as the time when, in the simplicity of early diction, (which yet lingers in the popular dialect), a distinction of number in the verb was unattended to; and that it afterwards continued in use in the common dialect. However, मुy as a singular might be defended, though by recurring to methods at variance with simplicity.
34. oìtos кeital, \&ec.] The imagery is supposed to be taken from Is. viii. 14. \& xxviii. 16., which passages are applied to the Messiah in Rom. ix. 33. See Grot., Wolf, Le Clerc, and Wets., who remark, that under the figure of a stone lying in a path, on which heedless persons trip, Christ is designated as a rock of stumbling to those who reject him, but a rock of support to those who avail themselves of his aid. Keī̈taı cls is not to be regarded as implying fatality, but to be taken in a popular acceptation, for to be ordained or appointed for any thing, as in Phil. i.
 are to be taken figuratively, of sin and misery, and reformation and happiness. Els oŋneĩov, scil. elvat. On the sense of onueĩo Commentators are not agreed. Most take it to denote a butt to be shot at ; which yields a very apposite sense; but it is unsupported by any authority and involves some confusion of metaphor. Yet this is no sufficient reason for rejection, since the popular dialect had numerous words not to be found in any writer, and the confusion in question is not unusual in Scripture. Besides, though onmeion be not found so used, yet the correspondent Latin term signum has that sense in Lament. iii. 12. (cited here by Maldonati), Tetendit arcum suum, et posuit me quasi signum ad sagittam. So Vulgate. The LXX. has oxomov. So also Gloss Cyrilli : Signum. ó axóros. Thus it would appear that this signification is either a Latin one, or that the Latin had it in common with the ordinary Greek dialect. In the above interpretation, therefore, I must acquiesce. The only other that has any semblance of truth is that of Grot. and most of the recent Commentators, 'a remarkable example of contradiction, rejection, and contempt.' Avrid. is to be taken in a sense which approsches to the Future, 'is to be spoken against.


 $\kappa а \rho \delta_{\iota} \omega \nu \nu \delta_{\iota} a \lambda о \gamma \iota \sigma \mu o i ́$.
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35．кal－ò̀̀］＇quia－imo．＇Soũ aúrîs，for ocautñs；perhaps by a popular idiom．In tiv $\psi u x$ ．$\delta$ ．po $\mu \phi$ aia is figurative language，similar to what we find in the Poetic parts of the $O$ ．T．， and indeed in the Classical Poets，by which men＇s minds are said to be wounded as the body is transfixed with arrows，swords，\＆c．Several examples are adduced by Wets．We can be at no loss to imagine the many ways in which this prophecy was fulfilled，without supposing， with some，that Mary should suffer martyrdom．
－ö́mos $\dot{\alpha} \nu$－$\delta i a \lambda o \gamma$ ．］The sense is，＂in order that the real disposition of every one［to truth and virtue］may be disclosed．＇
36．трофйтเs］Of the various senses which have been assigned to this term，the one best entitled to attention is that of the antients and Grot．，adopted by Schleus．，＂one endued with the $\chi$ d $\rho \iota \sigma \mu \alpha$ ，or Spiritual grace of uttering Di －
 mo八入ais is，per hypallagen，for mo八u่ т $\rho \circ \beta$ ．＂${ }^{\circ} \tau \eta$ i $\pi \tau \AA$ à，scil．$\mu$ о́va．At Xipa sub．yúvn，which is sometimes expressed，especially in the earlier writers．The very long widowhood of Anna is particularly mentioned，since virtuous widow－ hood was held in great honour among the Jews， and even Gentiles．See Joseph．Ant．xviii．6， 6. and Val．Max．ii．1， 3.
37．oix dфібтато dixd тoū iepoū］An hyper－ bolical expression，importing that she assiduously attended at all the stated periods of public wor－ ship，both day and night，（for there were occa－ sionally night services of sacred music），and perhaps that she spent most of her time in the temple，engaged in prayer and holy meditation．
 i．e．at the time that Simeon uttered the above words．＇A $\nu \dot{\omega} \mu о \lambda$ oyeito $\tau \bar{\omega} \kappa$ ．This is by some rendered，＇returned thanks．＇That sense，how－
ever，is confined to the Classical writers，and even in them has xápou added，and is accom－ panied by no Dative．It is better to follow the sense which the word bears in kindred passages of the LXX．（as Ps．1xxix．13．）and render，＇re－ turned praises to the Lord．＇The two significa－ tions，however，merge into each other．Aüroū， scil．тoù тadoiov．＇Ey＇Iep．must be construed with $\pi \bar{a} \sigma t$ ．$\Lambda u ̛ \tau \rho \omega \sigma \iota v$ ．The word here seems to include the notions of deliverance and redemp－ tion．Most of the Jews thought only of the temporal，the wiser few took it in the spiritual sense．

40．Xápıs $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text {coù，\＆c．］Raphel，Wets．，Camp．，}}$ and Wakef．take these words，by an idiom con－ nected with the oblique cases of $\Theta$ eds to denote greatness，or excellence，and，by a common sig－ nification of Xdpıs（grace）to denote that he was of extraordinary comeliness．But there is no example of $\chi^{d} \rho$ ts in the N．T．in any nearer sense than gracefulness of speech，which cannot here apply．Besides，Xd́pis $\quad$ oũ $\theta \in o u ̄ ~ i s ~ o f ~ s u c h ~ f r e-~$ quent occurrence in the N．T．，especially in St． Luke＇s works，that the Evangelist would never have ventured on introducing such an idiom of Oeds as that just adverted to，in this case，as mis－ apprehension would be sure to arise．In fact， xapıs $\theta_{\text {eoū，except }}$ in a few passages where it has reference to the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit，always denotes in the N．T．the favour of God to men．And this is placed beyond doubt by a kindred passage，infra ver． 52.

41．غ̇торєйоито］＇used to go．＇All the males were required to attend at the three festivals at Jerusalem ；and females，though not commanded． yet used often to attend，especially at the Pass－ over．

42．¿்vaßávт Jesus；which，indeed，is implied in the preced－
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 $\pi \mathrm{ots}$ ．
 years（which was considered as the age of puberty，and was that when the children were put to learn some trale）was，as appears from the Rabbinical writers，that at which the above obligation was thought binding，when too they were solemnly introduced into the Church，and initiated in its doctrines and cere－ monies．
43．$\tau \alpha \mathrm{s} \dot{\eta} \dot{\boldsymbol{j} \dot{\rho} \rho \alpha \mathrm{s}] \text { namely，the eight that the }}$ festival lasted．
44．iv auvooia］The word properly denotes ＇a journeying together，＇and then，by metonymy， a company of fellow travellers．The Orientals express this by Caravan．Of the above sense examples have been adduced from the later Greek writers．＇AveSjitove，＇sought him out，＇ i．e．diligently；for the $\dot{\nu} \nu a$ is intensive．So Thucyd．ii． 8 ．$\pi d \nu \tau a \dot{d} \nu \in \zeta \eta \tau \epsilon i ̄ o$.
－тоís $\gamma \nu \omega \bar{\omega}$ oits］acquaintance．The word very rarely occurs as a substantive，（heing pro－ perly a participle or adjective）though it is found in Ps． $1 \times x$ viii． 9 ．
46．$\mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu$ ．$\left.\tau \rho \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \mathrm{c}\right]$ i．e．on the 3d day．The 1st．was spent in their journey；the 2 d ．in their return to Jerusalem ；and on the 3 d ．they found him．＇$\nu \nu \tau \bar{\varphi}$ iceww．＇By this is meant a court in which（as we learn from the Rabbinical writers） the doctors sat，for the purpose of public in－ struction．It is not necessary to press on the sense of $\dot{e} \nu \nu \dot{\nu} \dot{e} \sigma u$ ，which may be taken for＇$a$ mong them，＇＇viz．in the centre of an area round which the benches of the doctors were raised semicir－
 to suppose any thing like disputation，but modest interrogation．And indeed（as 1 have observed in Recens．Synop．）it is plain from the Rabbi－
nical citations in Lightf．that the Jewish doctors used such a plan of instruction as dealt much in interrogation both on the part of the teachers and the taught．
47．Tท̂̀ $\boldsymbol{\sigma u v e ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ] ~ ' i n t e l l i g e n c e , ' ~ ' n a t u r a l ~ s a g a - ~}$ city．＇So Thucyd．i．138．ф́́⿱㇒日勺心s $l \sigma \chi \dot{\nu} \nu$ ò $\eta \lambda \omega \sigma \sigma a s$
 droк．there is no Hendiadys（as Kuin．imagines） but $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ тais átoкן．is added，to show in what that $\sigma u ́ v \in \sigma t s$ especially consisted．
48．lớvtes a．］＇on seeing him，＇namely，there and thus employed．

49．Év тoĩs toù matoós Mou］Commentators are perplexed with this elliptical expression，in which there was perhaps a studied ambiguity． Some supply $\pi \rho \dot{d} \gamma \mu a \sigma \iota$ ，othens olкjuaб．The former is well supported by Classical examples， and if this were a Classical author，it might de－ serve the preference ；but in an Hellenistic one it cannot be admitted．Besides，the answer，on that sense，would scarcely be suitable to the question．It is therefore better，with the antient and a great majority of the modern Commenta－ tors，to supply olкijuaбt，of which ellipsis Wets． has adduced abundance of examples，both from the Classical and Scriptural writers．So Gen． $x$ li． 51 ．Ecclus．xlii． 10.
 $\theta a t$ is used not only of forcible and compulsory， but voluntary，subjection，as that of wives and of children．＇Pŕmata．Not sayings，but things， by a common Hellenistic idiom．

52．троє́коттє］＇advanced．＇In this sense there is（as I observed in Recens．Synop．）a metaphor taken from the felling of trees，or clearing of thickets，to effect a passage．＇H ${ }^{\text {＇inia．}}$ This is by some interpreted＇stature；by others，
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'age.' The latter is not amiss; but it would rather have required a double sal before $\sigma о ф i \alpha$; and the former is more suitable to the context. Both may have been in the mind of the Evangelist.
III. 1. On the chronological questions connetted with this passage (a subject that does not fall within the scope of the present work) the reader is referred to Dr. Hales, Mr. Benson, and Horne's Introduction.
2. 'tx' ${ }^{\prime} \rho \mathrm{X}$. "A. к al K.] There has been much perplexity occasioned by the use, in the Gospels and also in Joseph., of phraseology expressing or implying plurality, where the Law recognizes but one. In strict propriety there could be but one high priest at a time who held the office for life. But after the reduction of Judea to the Roman yoke, great changes were made in the office, and the occupants of an office which enjoyed almost Regal authority were changed at the will of the conquerors. Hence some have supposed that the office had been made annual, and that Annas and Caiaphas occupying it by turns, each, or both, might be said to be the High Priest. This, however, is a gratuitous supposition, and overturned by what is said in Joseph. Ant. xviii. 2, 2. It is not impossible that Caiaphas was the High Priest, and Annas his Sagan, or deputy, a title given to him by

Joseph. Ant. xviii. 6, 24. And great was the dignity of the Sagan, who was allowed, upon occasion, to perform the most sacred functions of the High Priest. Others, again, imagine that the title is given to Annas, as being the chief of Aaron's family then alive, and being regarded as the rightful High Priest by the Jews, though Caiaphas held the office by appointment of the Roman Governor. This, however, proceeds endirely upon supposition; and unless the second of the foregoing solutions should be the right one, it is better to acknowledge our ignorance of the cause of the appellation.
 the Lord was issued to John.' A formula inplying Divine authority, which occurs also in Jeri. 2.
3. кai $\eta \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ ] 'And he (accordingly) went.' Metayoias, repentance and reformation. Els, ' in order to [procure].
5. The Evangelist, it may be observed, cites this passage of the Prophet further than Matthew and Mark, because he was writing especially for Gentile converts, and the latter part of the queslion was necessary to assure them that the "salvation of God," and the participation in the privileges of the Gospel, extended to them as well as the Jews.
7. '̊ $\chi$ เò $\nu \bar{\omega} \nu$ ] 'ungrateful vermin!’

5 Act. 2 37. 11 Joh. 3 17. et 4. 80. Jac. 2. 15, 16.

Mate. 3. 11. Marc. 1. 7, 8 Joh. 1. 26. Act. 1.5. et 11.16 . et 13.16. et 13.25.
et 19. et 19.4.
Eane 44.3. Joel. 2. 28. Act. 2.4. et 11.15 u Matt. 3. 12.


11. aürois] And to the Pharisees more especially, as we learn from Matt. iii. 7. Charity is here selected as a prominent part of that moral virtue in which they were so notoriously deficient.
12. кal te入ติขat] also, or even. The Future in $\pi$ orinoouev here and just before is to be rendered by must rather than shall; a Hebraism. The $\pi o \iota \eta \sigma \omega \mu \in \nu$ of many antient MSS., edited by Scholz, is evidently a gloss.
13. $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\nu}-\pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma e \tau \epsilon]$ This use of т $\rho a \sigma \sigma \in, \nu$, as said of taxes, (like perficere in Latin), is frequent in the Classical writers. The sense was either to eract or collect ; the former was the idea of the payer, the latter of the receiver. The difference between the active and middle forms is this; the active signifies to collect for another's use, the middle to collect for one's own. $\Delta \iota a \tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} \sigma e t \nu$ is a vor signata of legal enactments, especially such as relate to laying on taxes. See Duker on Thucyd. iii. 70. The $\pi a \rho a$ after a comparative, or what implies comparison (especially $\mu \in i\}(\omega \nu$ or коеiтt $\omega \nu$ ) is used for $\eta^{\eta}$, hoth in the Scriptural and Classical writers. The literal sense of $\pi a \rho \alpha$ in this use is 'placed ulongside of,' i.e. ' compared uith.' Our Lord does not, we see, condemn their profession, but only the abuse of the power it gave them.
14. $\tau \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon \cup$ ónevot] Michaelis thinks that this denotes ' men under arms or going to battle;' for he imagines that Herod's war with Aretas had already commenced, and that there is here reference to those engaged in that service. A chronological reason, however, occurs to overturn this supposition; and moreover the Article would thus be indispensable. The proprietas lingua also, indeed, requires its presence as used to denote orpactī̃at, and describing
whole classes of persons, (see Middlet. iii. 2, 2.) but Hellenistic phraseology does not strictly observe such minutix.

- $\mu \eta \delta \dot{e v a}$ dsaceíonre] This is by many Commentators taken to mean 'do not harass ;' a signification found in the Classical writers. But some more special sense seems to be intended. It is therefore best explained as equivalent to, and indeed formed from, the Latin concutere, which has been proved to have the signification 'to extort money by dint of threats of any kind
 d' $\rho$ Xóvrcov. whence Schleus. supposes here an ellipse of ina $\alpha$ Xóvtav. It is, however, unfounded. Dia $\epsilon$ let imports extortion by dint of threats of violence; rukoфavteiv that by threats of unjust accusation, false information, \&c.
 a soldier's pay consisted chiefly in a supply of food, and was called $\dot{\delta} \psi \omega^{\circ} \nu \iota o \nu$, from $\delta \psi o \nu$, meat. In process of time an equivalent in money was substituted for the supply of food; and then o $\psi$ civsov, which had originally meant support, came to denote pay, though still some allowances in kind were left the soldier, which probably opened a way to the extortion alluded to.
 were waiting and in suspense; so Acts xxviii. 6.


16. dana $t]$ i. e. both those there and those at Jerusalem, who (we learn from Joh. i. 18.) had sent a message of inquiry.
17. eívry. TdV $\lambda$ aóv] ' he evangelized the people,' proclaimed to them the Gospel ; as Acts
 be joined with тapaкa入 $\overline{\hat{\nu}}$, and the sense is, 'by the use of many other exhortations.'

Kє $\boldsymbol{\phi}$. IV.
KATA $\Lambda O Y K A N$.





























[^9]sense, then, is, 'Jesus was beginning to be of about 30 years, i. e. he had nearly completed his 30th year. I grant that this is somewhat anomalous phraseology; but it is not more so than some other modes of expression to be found in Scripture, and, no doubt, formed on the popular mode of speaking. There must not be an $\alpha \pi \delta$ supplied before $\left.\begin{array}{c} \\ \tau \\ \infty\end{array}\right)$, (with some recent Commentators), for in this sense clvat carries the Genit. alone. See Matth. Gr. Gr. p. 519. Obs. 2.

- wis dvopiగeto] This evidently alludes to his Divine origin.

36. Eepoix] This (for Eapoux) is found in almost all the best MSS., Yersions, and the Edit. Princ. and other early Editions, and is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz.
 which is found in Matthew.
37. ทuépas тeбסapáкоvтa] These words would



${ }_{i}$ Deut. 6. 13. et 10 . ${ }^{20}{ }^{2}$ Sam. 7. 3.
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seem to connect with the retpayónevos following, as some Editors take them. But Matthew describes the temptation as taking place at the close of that period. Most recent Commentators attempt to remove the discrepancy by supposing the meaning to be, not that Jesus was tempted 40 days in succession, but that, at various times during those days he was exposed to temptations, besides those which the Evangelist now proceeds to enumerate. This method, however, cannot be admitted. At least it is better, with some antient and modern Commentators, to connect the words with the preceding. Пeєрa̧ómevos, however, is not, I conceive, put for $\pi \in \iota \rho a \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota$, but it is a nominaticus pendens, for Genit. absolute. This mode of taking the passage is confirmed by Mark iv. 1., who here follows Luke :

 xetpa̧onevos is implied tóтe from the context. That, however, will not, as in the case of $\delta$ ca $\dot{\eta} \mu$. $\tau \epsilon \sigma \sigma$., involve any contradiction, since what takes place at the close of any period of time is understood populariter to fall within that term. I must further observe, that in $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \in \tau o$ just before, there seems to be included (per significationem
prægnantem) кal $\eta_{\nu \nu}$ scil. ${ }^{\text {© } \kappa \in i}$, which is expressed by Mark.
4. $\dot{o} \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho$.] The $\dot{o}$ is omitted in very many of the best MSS., and cancelled by Math., Griesb., and Scholz. But there is not sufflcient authority to cancel it.
 may paraphrase, ' and the glory which proceeds from the government of them.'
7. $\pi \bar{a} \tau a]$ This (for the common reading $\pi \dot{\mu} \nu \tau a)$ is found in almost all the best MSS., with several Versions, Fathers, and early Edd. It has also been received by Wets., Matth., Griesb., and others, down to Scholz, to whose authority I have yielded. As being the more difficult reading, it seems to deserve the preference. Yet $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau a$ may be defended, as being more natural, and agreeable to the popular style, though propriety requires $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a$ as referred to

8. $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \dot{\rho}$ ] This and the $\dot{o}$ in the next verse are omitted in the best MSS., and cancelled by almost all the recent Editors.
 fluence of the Spirit.' Ka $\theta^{\prime}$ '̈ $\lambda \eta \mathrm{s}$, throughout all. This sense occurs also in Acts ix. 31. and
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is sometimes found in the later Classical writors.

16. $\alpha \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta d \nu$.] For the reading of the Scripsure was required to be performed by both miniter and people standing.
17. $\left.\beta_{1} \beta \lambda i o \nu\right]$ The $\beta_{i} \beta \lambda_{t a}$ of the Hebrews, and indeed of the antients in general, were rolls fastened to two laths with handles, by holding which in his hand, the reader could roll or unroll the book at his pleasure.
18. éxpıoé $\mu e$ ovary.] This portion, taken from Is. lxi. 1., was selected (for that is very consistent with the expression eve) by Jesus to draw the attention of the people, and to show its fulfilment in himself; as also with allusion to the reason why he was called Christ, and his Religion termed the Gospel. Its application to the Messiah is acknowledged by the most able Jewish Expositors. Indeed the prophecy throughout admits of a spiritual interpretation, and an application to all times and all people. "Expire. This signifies not so much to be anointed. as inaugurated, introduced into an office; which with eminent persons, as kings, prophets, priests, \&cc., was always conferred by unction. Eva $\gamma$ reiíracoat. Very many MSS. and early Ld. have the common reading eviayरe入i! $\in \sigma \theta a t$. But the other is preferred by almost all Editors from Math. to Scholz.

- iárá ted in a few MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and have been rejected by Grot. and Mill, and cancelled by Griesb. and others; but most rashly, since the words are found both in the Hebr. and LXX., and as they are only omitted in six MSS., we may imagine that it was merely from the carelessness of the Scribes. In fact, the words, I suspect, formed one line of the Archetype, and on that account might be the more easily omitted, especially as the line before began with a word of the same ending as that which commenced
 cause have arisen many hundreds, nay thousands, of lacume in the Classical writers. Moreover, the words are required by the parallelism, in
 respond to each other, the latter signifying the
afflicted, or contrite, as the former the distressed or poor in spirit, according as the literal or the spiritual sense be adopted. Dunt. is occasionally found in the Classical writers, in a metaphorical sense, of mental sorrow.
The correspondent terms which follow, ald-
 likewise a double sense. "Arecas in this sense of deliverance from captivity, is found also in the Classical writers. With respect to rug ${ }^{2}$ ins, the sense of the Hebrew, 'those who are bound,' is greatly preferable, though the other may be jusunified by taking the term to denote those who are as it were blind with long confinement in dark dungeons. In the spiritual sense al $\chi \mu$. will denote those who are bound with the chain of $\sin$; and $\tau 0 \phi \lambda$ is, those who are blinded by sin and Satan, the "blind people that have eyes,"," (Is. xiii. 8.) or those that "seeing, see not." Math. xiii. 13.) The next clause $\alpha \pi o \sigma r e i \lambda a t-$ ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\prime} \phi \epsilon \sigma e s$ is not found in either the Hebr. or LXX. in this passage, though it is in C. 58. It was, no doubt, inserted in reading from that passage, as illustrative. As to the conjecture of Owen, that the words are a gloss, it is unfounded; and that of Randolph, that the Hebrew had formerly contrained a clause to this effect, is too hypothetical. 'E $\nu$ d $\phi$ é $\sigma \in!$ is not, as most Commentators impgive, for els $\dot{a} \phi \epsilon \sigma L \nu$; but may be rendered 'in freedom,' a phrase for the adjective free. The word is taken in the same sense just before.

19. кпри́そat-סєктóv] This sums up the whole of the above, in words which contain an allusion to the year of Jubilee, when, by sound of rumpet, was proclaimed deliverance, and restoration of every kind. Thus it is meant, that the Gospel is to the Law what the Jubilee year was as compared to all others. In the application, éviaucòs will denote time generally. $\Delta \epsilon \kappa \tau \delta \nu$ is for $\dot{a}_{\rho} \rho \sigma \sigma$ tiv, as 2 Cor. vi. 2. кatyòs ósxtós. The word is not found in the Classical writers. 'EKg $\theta_{\imath} \sigma \epsilon$. As those did, who proceeded to address some instruction to the people, after having read the portion of Scripture. See Vitringa de Syn. Jud. p. 899.
20. $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma a \nu$ dj $\tau \epsilon \nu i$ routes] 'were fixedly gazing.' The Dative is here for the Ascus. with els, which is the usual construction.
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 ре́véo．
 ing．＇And so most Commentators take it．But that involves a very harsh catachresis．It is better（with the Syr．，Beng．，De Dieu，and Campb．）to take the sense to be，＇which ye have heard，＇（or rather，literally，＇which is now in your ears．＇）And they suppose an ellipsis of the relative．But this，however frequent in He － brew，is very rare in Greek，and would here be so harsh that I should prefer to suppose an $\eta \geqslant$ had slipped out after au̇ri．The $\eta$ twice occurring just before would make this the more easily absorbed．The Syriac Translator certainly had it in his copy．
22．d $\mu a \rho \tau \dot{\rho} \rho o u v a$.$] Maptupeìy with a Dative$ signifies＇to bear testimony to or for，＇and almost always implies in favour of．The word here ex－ presses commendation on the grounds afterwards
 of the preceding．This syntax of $\theta a v \mu a ́ \zeta c u v$ with d $\pi l$（at）occurs also in Mark xii．17．and some－ times in the Classical writers．$\Delta t a$ or $d v$ is more usual．Tท̄s $\chi$ d́pıcos is a Genit．of a substantive put for an adjective（graceful and eloquent．） $\mathrm{X} \boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\prime}$ os $\lambda$ ó ${ }^{\prime}$ cov is a frequent phrase in the Clas－ sical writers．
 art the personage foretold by lsaiah．
 or $d \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ ，as elsewhere in the $N$ ．T．and sometimes in the Classical writers．＂ETn－© is here showing by examples that God most fre－ quently communicates his extraordinary bene－
fits to those who are capable of receiving them， passing over the unworthy．In dк入eloon，we have a metaphor occurring also in Revel．xi． 6. and Ecclus．xlviii．3．＇ $\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{s}}$ ，for ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ，as with the same syntax（the Indicative）in Mark iv．27．and Heb．iii． 11.

26．el $\mu \eta \dot{j}$ els $\Sigma d \rho$.$] On this use of el \mu \dot{j}$ pre－ ceded by a negative sentence，and involving an ellipsis in which the verb is repeated，see Viger． p．510．and Wahl．「uvaíкa xrpav is not a pleonasm，but a primitive oratio plena，like the old Latin vidua mulier in Terence，and our vidow voman．

29．¿そॄ́ßa入ov］＇drove or hurried him．＇＇Oфpúor． This was a term denoting one of the parts of the

 pes）applied to the various objects in nature， especially hills．Such indeed is the case in all
 in very many MSS．and the early Edd．，and is cancelled by most recent Editors．Kataкpp $\mu$－ vigal．This was，indeed，as among the antient Romans，a death adjudged by the law；but in the present case this would have been a tumul－ tuary proceeding，like the stoning of Stephen．
 any supernatural power，is not said，but may seem to be implied．Though most recent Com－ mentators（and Turtullian of old）discountenance that idea．They think（see Heumann and
 them．＇See John ix．59．and Note．
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32．dy dEovala］＇with authority．＇＇Eォeqouala （for ${ }^{\text {E }}$ ovaia）is found in very many MSS．and carly Eddo．，and received by all the best Editors．

33．тvè̀ $\alpha$ дьaцоviou $\dot{\alpha}$ ．．］This is a blending of two synonymous expressions，for the sake of greater force．
35．Td］The word is omitted in most of the antient MSS．and almost all the early Fd．，and is cancelled by Wets．，Matth．，Griesb．，and other Editors，down to Scholz．M Mod $\beta \lambda \alpha \dot{\psi}$ av a．， ＇after having done him no hurt．＇

36．$\theta \dot{\alpha} \mu \beta_{08}$ ］i．e．a mingled feeling of amaze－ mont and awe．

38．$\eta \pi \in \nu \theta$ ．］The $\dot{r}$ is not found in most of the antient MSS．and in the Ed．Prince．，and other early Fd．，and is cancelled by Wets．，Math．， Griesb．，Tittm．，Vat．，and Scholz．
V．2．$\dot{\text { c }} \sigma \tau \bar{\omega} \tau a]$ i．e．as opposed to being in motion．Compare viii．38．The Greeks used oriya，and the Latins stare，to express the situa－ tion of ships whether at anchor，or fastened on shore．See Recons．Synop．＇A $\overline{\text { exr }} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda u v a v , ' ~ h a d ~}$ washed，＇i．e．had been washing．The $d \pi$ in $d \pi \pi^{\pi} \lambda$ ．signifies off，with respect to the filth of the fish，\＆c．$\Delta i x$ roy，Valckn．remarks，is from
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3．リpwitngev］＇requested．＇This use is fre－ quent in the N．T．，and occurs occasionally in the LXX．，but never in the Classical writers． ＇Exavarayeì．Sub．vaī̀．I have in Recens． Synop．compared Herodot．vii．100．Tàs dé ע́́as

 $\gamma_{i l}^{\epsilon l}$ is equivalent to our ward in composition．
 which signify to bring to land，see my Note on Thucyd．（Translation）．Vol．1．p． 52.
4．xa入a $\sigma a \tau \epsilon]$ Xa $\lambda \bar{\alpha} \nu$ is a vox sol．de hac re．，
 äypav．Literally，＇for a catching，＇in order that something may be caught．
5．$\dot{\epsilon \pi} \subset \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha]$＇Exiord ${ }^{2} \eta \mathrm{~s}$ properly denotes one who is set over any persons or business，as here that of instruction；and is thus equivalent to master or teacher，dò̀óaкалоs，used by the other Evangelist．The latter sense is rather rare in the Classical writers ；when it does occur，it denotes a teacher of any art，as opposed to a novice． Primatı，command．So the Heb．Thy．This is not，however，merely a Hebraism，since it is found in a monumental inscription in Herodot．
 which passage，it may be observed，confirms the opinion that there is an ellipse of $\pi \in \pi o \Delta \theta \omega$ ．s．
 are terms appropriate to hunting and fishing；of which examples are cited by Wets．The read－
 in all the best MSS．and early Edd．，and is adopted by all the best Editors．
7．סcé $\rho \dot{p} \dot{\prime} \gamma \nu v i o]$ ］＇had begun to break，＇or had well nigh broke．So Alciphron cited by Valckn．
 not unfrequently to oclur in the herring fishery． Karévevoav．Literally，made signs with their hands，beckoned．See Note supra i． 22 ．Toû
è $\lambda$ Oóvтas．Sub．：̀veкa，for $7 \nu a$ ，with a Subjunc－ tive．$\sum v \lambda \lambda a \beta \in \varepsilon \theta a \iota$ ，to take hold of，i．e．help． The verb has，in complete construction，a Dative of the person governed of oiv in composition；a Genitive of the thing dependent upon refl un－ derstood，and an Accusative of the thing also dependent on кaтá understood．But in the best Greek writers the Accus．is found almost always omitted，not unfrequently the Genit．，and some－ times all three．＂Qore $\beta v \theta$ IY eodat，＇so that they were beginning to sink．＇The Infinitive present sometimes corresponds to the Imperfect rather than the Present．
8． $\left.\bar{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \in \lambda \theta e d \pi^{\prime} \dot{\xi} \mu o \bar{u}\right]$ Valckn．takes this to be， a popular phrase for＇depart from my ship；＇
 used to denote entrance to，or departure from， any one＇s house；as Luke i．28．clori $\lambda$ ain $\pi \rho d s$
 This proof，however，as regards the phrase $\} \xi \in \lambda \theta \in i v d{ }^{2} \pi d$ is defective，and the sense in ques－ tion would here be frigid．But it is of more im－ portance to advert to the scope of this request． To refer it，with most modern Commentators，to Peter＇s superstitious fears of death or some heavy calamity，as having seen a supernatural person， is neither doing justice to the Apostle，nor war－ ranted by the context，which requires the more judicious view taken by Euthym．，Capell．，Grot．， Lightf．，Doddr．，Rosenm．，and Kuin．，who re－ gard it as an exclamation indicative of profound humility and deep reverence，as of one un－ worthy to appear in the presence of so great a personage．Thus his casting himself at Jesas＇ feet may be regarded as adoration to a Divine person．The $\theta a \mu \beta$ os which follows imports，not （as Kuin．explains）horror，but a mixed feeling of amazement and awe．
9．тefiéoXev〕＇possessed，＇as 2 Macc．iv． 16.

Kєф. V.
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 lively metaphor. Though, indeed, terms of hunting and fishing are, by the Greek and He brew writers, sometimes used of those who attach men to themselves, or others; as I have in Recens. Synop. proved and illustrated by numerous original examples from Xenoph., Diog. Laert., Plut., Ælian, and others.
14. $\left.d \lambda \lambda \alpha d \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \omega^{2} y \delta \epsilon i \xi_{0 \nu}\right]$ This change of the construction from the indirecta to the directa oratio is sanctioned by the usage of the best Classical writers. It may be regarded as a relic of the inartificial simplicity of primitive diction.
17. каi סóva $\mu$ เs-aúтoús] Render, 'and the power of the Lord was (exerted) to heal them.' By kupiou some understand God. But that would require $\mu$ et' aivoū (i.e. Christ) to be supplied; an ellipse which can by no means be admitted. By aürous must, as the recent Commentators have seen, be understood, not tho

Pharisees, but the sick. Thus (Kuin. observes) the Hebrews use the pronoun relative when there is no antecedent noun, though it may easily be understood from the context. This is very true, and the idiom is by no means confined to the Hebrew writers; but it is here not applicable, for aúrovs plainly has reference to the aircis (i.e. döcuตv) at ver. 15.
19. $\left.\delta \iota a^{\prime}\right]$ This is omitted in very many MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz; and with reason; for it is plainly an addition of the Scholiasts, as infra xix. 4. Since, however, the ellipse of $\delta \iota a$ is somewhat harsh, I am inclined to suspect that molas is not the true reading, but mota, sub. odow, which, though not noted from any of the MSS., seems to have been read by the Italic and Vulgate Translators, who render ' quà parte.' The s might easily have arisen from the efollowing.
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posite one (applied to Diogenes) from Dio Chrys. Orat. viii. p. 131. Morell. ग̄ ty Tờ






 тติ.
35. кal öтay d $\quad$.] The кal is omitted in several MSS. and the greater part of the Versions, and in most of those it is inserted before tóve, exactly as in the parallel passages of Natthew and Mark, and as 1 conceive, the Evangelist wrote; for it is difficult to account for the kal here. To call it a Hebrew pleonasm is to shuffle over the difficulty. And yet it cannot well be rendered nempe, with some. To construe it with т $\dot{\text { te }}$ (as do Homberg and Abresch.) is doing utter violence to the construction. It should seem that the кal was first omitted by accident. then expressed in the margin to be inserted, and finally brought in at a wrong place.
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36. dxi $^{2} \beta \lambda_{\eta \mu \alpha}$ ] This is omitted in many MSS., and is cancelled by Wets. Mill, Markl., Matth., and Tittm., but retained by Scholz and Gratz, though with a mark of probable expunction. Certainly to cancel it is very objectionable. It would be somewhat harsh, and such as is unusual in the plain style of Scripture to supply a noun from such a distance. Besides, the word is found in all the Versions, except two later ones of little authority, and more than 3-4ths of the MSS., including some of the most antient. I cannot therefore but suspect that the omission was accidental, and the cause of it will immediately appear, if we consider that many MSS. (some very antient) and Edd. have $\tau \delta{ }^{\prime} \pi i \beta \lambda_{\eta \mu a}$; for it is obvious how easily the word $d \pi i \beta \lambda \eta \mu a$ might be lost by means of the two $\tau$ d's. Thus those very MSS. in which this word is omitted bear testimony of the existence of the first $\tau d$ in their Archetype. I have therefore admitted it into the text.
39. Of this illustration, which is confined to Luke, the scope, as the best antient and modern Commentators agree, is of a piece with the preceding doctrine, that as use forms the taste, so men's long accustomed modes are not speedily to be changed, nor can be suddenly initiated into austerities.
VI. 1. èv $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \alpha \beta \beta \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\varphi}$ devt.] It is impossible
for me to notice, much less review, the very numerous conjectures (for we can reach no farther) which have been propounded as to the sense of this obscure expression; nor is it necessary, as the only one that has any semblance of truth is that of Theophyl. and Euthym., among the antients, and Scaliger, Lightf., Casaub., Whitby, Schleus., Kuin., \&c. of the moderns, namely, that the Sabbath intended is the first after the second day of unleavened bread, that on which the wave sheaf was commanded to be offered up, and from which, and not the first day of the Passover, the fifty days were reckoned to the Pentecost. Hence it is no wonder that all the Sabbaths from the Passover to the Pentecost took their


- 廿由'Xovтes] 'rubbing them.' This word is of rare occurrence. Yet it is adduced from Nicand. Ther. $590 \& 62$, and кara\%. from Herodot. iv. 75.

7. aürdv] This is omitted in very many MSS. and early Edd., and also in some Versions, and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. But it is found in the parallel passage of Mark, and is so agreeable to the style of the N.T., that I suspect the word to have been cancelled by some over-nice antient critics. The testimony of Versions is, in a cace of this kind, of little weight.
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8. катฑ him.'
9. dтepшт ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \omega$ ن́.] 'I will ask you a question.' For dxo入érat very many MSS. and early Edd. have dxomreivac, which is received by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz; but perhaps without sufficient reason; for the new reading seems to be a gloss.
10. $\alpha \dot{u} \tau \bar{\omega}]$ This (for the common reading $\tau \bar{\omega}$ $d \nu 0 \rho \omega \pi \omega)^{\circ}$ is found in a very great number of MSS., the Ed. Princ., and the most important Versions; and has been edited by Wets., Griesb., Matth., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. The common reading is, no doubt, from the margin. 'Eroincev oürco. The oulcos is omitted in very many MSS. and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and others ; but injudiciously; for a great part of those MSS. have d'є́тeıves for dToiñov, and with that the oivoo is inconsistent. To encroincev the oürco is almost indispensable, and it is confirmed by a similar use in ix. 15. xii. 45. Acts xii. 8. Luke ii. 48. iii. 11. vi. 31. x. 37. ' $\mathbf{r} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ 'ท's is omitted in very many MSS., and is cancelled by most Editors. See, however, the Note on Matth. xii. 13. and Mark iii. 5.
11. àvoías ] 'fury, rage;' a signification found in Thucyd. ii. 48. and elsewhere. A similar idiom occurs in our own language in the vulgar use of the word mad.
 On the interpretation of $\pi \rho o \sigma e v x, y$ there has been some difference of opinion. The antients, and most moderns, take it to mean 'prayer to God;' while some of the earlier modern Commentators and others of the more recent ones, as Markl., Wets., Doddr., and Campb., maintain that it signifies proseucha, an oratory. And that there were Jewish places of worship so called is undoubted. But whether that sense is here to be assigned, is another question. Those Commentators adduce, indeed, several reasons why the
common interpretation cannot be admitted. They urge that rpooevxi' toû $\theta c o \hat{v}$, in the sense prayer to God, is abhorrent from the simplicity of Scriptural expression, and subversive of ana-
 some place where the night is spent. But osaעuкrepevect is not ouly used of places where, but of things or business in which the night is occupied, as in the examples cited in Recens. Synop., e. gr. Phalar. Ep. $\lambda \omega^{\prime} \beta \eta$. $\delta \iota a v$. And as to simplicity of expression, it is no more violated here than in numerous other cases, where the use of the Genitive falls under that Rule of Winer's Gr. N. T. $§ 23.1$. p. 71. "The Genitive after nouns which indicate feeling, speech, or action in respect to any thing, is sometimes to be understood as indicating the relation which that feeling, speech, or action has toward that thing;" e. gr. Matt. xiii. 18. Luke vi. 7. Acts iv. 9. See Matthiæ Gr. Gr. § 313. In such cases the Genit. has the force of an Accus. with xpós.

Wholly ungrounded are the other objections of Campb. ; for as to subversion of analogy, analogy must not be sought by placing on the bed of Procrustes whatever deviates from it; and variety is as much the character of antient writings as analogy. The rest of his objections proceed on a confusion of antient with modern modes of expression. See Recens. Synop. As to that which concerns the employment of the Articls here, it has been satisfactorily answered by Middlet., who has shown that it is not uncommon with mporevxi in the sense of prayer. See Matt. xxi. 22. Acts i. 14. 1 Cor. vii. 5.

By prayer we are here to understand not merely prayer, but holy meditation, and that devout thoughtfulnese, which usually precedes, accompanies, and follows fervent prayer. See a passage of Artemid. adduced in Recens. Synop.
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17. тórov xed̀soū] To reconcile this with the description in Matthew, (for the discourse here recorded is substantially the same with that), we may suppose that it was a sort of high, but level, table-land. Thus the only formidable discrepancy is removed.
 droxd. signify 'to be troubled or vexed, whether by irksome business, or by such sickness as hinders any one from pursuing his occupation;' of which senses abundant examples, both with yórou expressed and understood, are adduced by Wets. and others. In the N. T. and LXX., however, the latter is never found, but only that of being vexed, troubled, as said of demoniacal
 uáтcov diкaӨd $\rho \tau \omega y$. and Tob. vi. 7. dee viva
 such is plainly the sense here, and not that assigned by those who advocate the hypothesis of Mede. For the sick and the demoniacs are here plainly distinguished.
For $\dot{\text { ind }}$ many MSS. have $d \pi d$, which is edited by Math., Griesb., Titty., Vat., and Scholz. But it does not appear that $\alpha \pi d$ in this sense is ever used in the N. T. after a verb pasgive, while sid frequently is, both in the N.T. and the Classical writers; and, indeed, this sense of origin, or cause, is not strong enough to suit the Passive. So in this very phrase we have ind, at Acts v. 16. Compare also Acts x. 38. \& xiii. 4. As to MS. authority, it is of little weight in words so perpetually confounded as $\alpha \pi d$ and ©
 not, any more than Mark v. 30 ., prove the nocion, that the power by which the sick were healed was exerted by a sort of efflux, or effluvium
from his body. See Note on Mark v. 30. The best Commentators, antient and modern, are
 in Ruth i. 13., simply means se exercebat, and is equivalent to dvepreiv.
 excommunication among the Jews. On which see Vitringa de Synag, and other authorities refared to in Recess. Synop. 'Ex ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \omega \sigma$ 上pod. On the sense of this expression Commentators are not agreed. Now ${ }^{\text {en }} \kappa \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda$ et ${ }^{\prime}$ signifies generally to cast out, both in a civil and in a military sense, i. e. either 'to banish,' or 'to cashier.' It also signifies 'to displace officers,' or 'reject actors.' Hence many here assign the sense 'to reject with scorn and ignominy;' which is preferable to the sense 'to banish,' adopted by Kuin., or 'to defame,' supported by Campb.; though the signification is wholly unauthorized. Wolf regards it as a fuller expression of the sense contained in dфopicwort. But it seems rather to advert to the treatment which they would experience at the hands of the herathess, as $d \phi o \rho i \sigma=0 \sigma$ to that from the Jews. How covered with obloquy and contempt were the primitive Christians by the Heathens, we have abundant testimony both in Scripture and in the writings of the first Christian Apologists. See Grot. and Whitby.
23. $\chi$ d $\rho \eta \tau e$ ] This (for $\chi$ xipece) is found in almost all the best MSS., and is adopted by Wets., Griesb., Math., Tittm., Vat. and Scholz. On which use of the Subjunctive in an Imperafive or hortatory sense, see Butm., Matth., and Herm. on Viz. Taiga $\dot{\alpha}$ is rightly edited by Knapp, for taìta, as the sense (namely, duicos) requires, and with the countenance of ISS.
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25. oual $\left.{ }^{\circ} \mu i \nu\right]$ Campb. in a long and able Note (which see in Recens. Synop.) shows that oval here is not imprecative, but declarative, Woe is unto! alas for you! A view of the subject which I have supported from Euthym. and others.
26. ovial, $8 \tau \alpha \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \bar{\omega} s, \& c$.] This was meant primarily for the Apostles and first teachers of the Gospel, but was intended to be applied to their successors. Grot. has appositely cited a narration respecting Phocion, recorded by Plut. T. ii. 187. F.. where we are told that when in his orations he had particularly pleased the multitude, he used to ask his friends whether any thing wrong had eacaped him in his address. Indeed, according to the old adage, obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit.
27. Tois $d^{2} \times$ óvoug $\nu \nu$ ] ' my hearens.'
30. The expressions in this and the foregoing verse are not to be too rigorously interpreted, since they are merely intended to inculcate a spirit of forbearance and meekness under injuries or deprivations. At $\tau \dot{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\alpha}$ subaud $x p r \mu a \tau \alpha$;

32. $x$ dipsc for civepyeria and its consequent $\mu \nu 006$ s. So Dionys. Hal. A. vi. 86. Tis d $\sigma \tau \iota \nu \nu^{j}$
 following verses $\mu$ óvov is to be supplied after ipâs.
35. xal סaver\}ere $\mu \eta \delta d \nu \quad \alpha \pi e \lambda \pi$.] On the sense of $\mu \eta \partial \overline{\text { y }} \nu d \pi \pi \lambda \lambda \pi$. the Commentators are not agreed. Some take it to mean ' nothing degpairing.' But though dime $\lambda^{2}$ ITG $w$ often signifies to despair, yet that it cannot have that sense here, is plain from the words of the preceding verse, тap' $\dot{\omega}$ d $\lambda \pi$ I! $d \pi \pi \lambda \pi$. in an active sense of causing despair.

But that sense of the word is unauthorized, and not here very suitable. The true interpretation seems to be that of most antient and modern Commentators, 'hoping for nothing again;' a sense which, however deficient in Classical authority, is very agreeable to analogy; for as

 examples are adduced by the Commentators of this omitting of one or two words noted by a preposition joined to a verb. So Athen. p. 649. dтeनीlecy for dotiety dixd tivos. The senpe, therefore, is: ' Lend to those from whom there is little hope of receiving back your money.' By lending must, however, (as Theophyl. and Campb. observe) be understood not letting out the money at interest; for that is an affair merely commercial, and comes not under the class of good offices. In like manner supra v. 34. т $\dot{\alpha}$ I $\sigma \alpha$ scil. xprjuata signifies (as Salmas. has proved) the same sum, the principal without interest. From numerous passages of the Classical writers which I have adduced in Recens. Synop., it appears that the heathens sometimes used to lend money to respectable persons brought to unmerited distress. And I have there observed that the words seem to have reference to that kind of beneficial collection in aid of distress which the Greeks called ipavio $\mu$ ds, and which has been illustrated by Casaub. on Theophrastus. If any one, for instance, had lost a considerable part of his property by shipwreck, fire, or any other calamity, it was not unusual for his friends to supply him with money, not to be paid back by any cortain day, but when convenient. This, however, they scarcely ever did except to those
 36 тous áxapíatous кai movnpoús．＂Yiveo日e oưv oiктípuoves，inaus．
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who they had some hope might（by a more pros－ perous turn of fortune）some time or other not only repay the money，but return the favour， which they termed dyrepavi\}esv. Whereas our Lord enjoins his hearers to do this good（to use the words of Thucydides，ii．40．）＂not with the narrow calculations of self－interest，but in the confidence of liberality ；＂a confidence reposed in Him who is the poor man＇s surety．
－viol r．i $\psi$ ．］i．e．either＇beloved of God，＇ （as in Ecclus．iv． 10 ．y fyou boфavois is mat－ pן－cal ég cis vids v viotov）or，＇you will be like unto God，as being animated with a spirit of benevolence similar to that of the Deity．The Art．is omitted in many MSS．and the Ed．Princ．， and is cancelled by Matth．，Griesb．，Tittm．Vat．， and Scholz；agreeably to the usage of Luke． See i．32，35， 76.

37．катаd́ка́そете］This word and $\dot{\alpha}$ то入．are properly judicial terms，the former signifying to condemn，the other to acquit，as also are крivere and кpi日ŋ̀re．All these terms，however，（as Grot．and other good Commentators have seen） are to be accommodated to private use．The three claupes advert，the list to sitting in severe judg－ ment on the faults of others；the 2d to passing condemnation on them．The 3 d enjoins a con－ trary spirit，that of judging for the best，acquit－ ting our neighbour of such charges as are not manifestly well founded．
38．didore \＆re．］With candour in judging is well subjoined liberality in giving，as a kindred virtue．Insomuch that，at the end of the verse，
 enjoin the exercise of the virtue mentioned in the preceding $v$. ．，by a metaphor derived from the imagery in this，in which the $\kappa \alpha \lambda d \nu$（fair and full）is further illustrated by the terms zeerter－
 which have reference to the three principal methods of giving abundant measure among the

Jews；for，as Buxt．observes，there were many， such as the supernatans，the abrasa，the accu－ mulata，pressa，agitata，operta．Of these the abrasa corresponds to our mode of measuring corn，by upheaping the measure，and cutting off the cumulus with a lath．The cumulata and operta were still better than the abrasa；but the pressa，agitata，and supernatans，corresponding to the three here mentioned，were the best．＇ $\mathrm{r}_{\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \rho-\mathrm{p}}$ $e \kappa x$ ．is not to be taken，with almost all Com－ mentators，of a measure of liquids，（for that is inconsistent with its being＂poured into the lap，＂as just after）but，with Euthym．and Beza， of a measure of solids，by an idiom common to all languages．Thus there is a climax；for the viтepeкx．supposes that the measure has been already pressed down and shaken together．In
 allusion to the Oriental custom，of receiving a measure and other dry articles in the bosom， or lap of their flowing vests．See 2 Kings iv． 39．Prov．xv．33．And so also among the Greeks and Romans，e．gr．Herodot．vi．125．Tdy
 ii．3，71．nucesque ferre sinu luro．The expres－ sion is proverbial and expressive of what generally takes place．Similar ones are cited by the Com－ mentators from the Rabbinical and the Classical writings．

40．The purport of the words in their present application（for the expression occurs in another sense elsewhere in Scripture）is this：＂The dis－ ciple is not usually above his teacher；but every one who is（or would be）a thorough instructed person，a finished scholar，is，or may be，as per－ fect as his teacher．＂Thus as the disciple gene－ rally follows his master＇s example，so if you neglect your duty to God，neither will your hearers observe their＇s．Katapti\}etv signifies to make complete and perfect．The connexion of the verses following is clear．
n Matt. 7.
et 12. 33.

- Mats. 7. 16.
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[^10]3. требßutépous $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ 'I.] Perhaps the elders of the synagogue which he had built.
 not a Latinism, dEios must be taken in the absolute sense, of which I have adduced numerous examples in Recens. Synop. IIafé $\boldsymbol{e}_{\mathrm{G}}$ is Attic for жар́́ky, (on which see Matth. Gr. Gr. § 197. \& 496. and Winer's Gr. Gr. §7.2.) one of the many Atticisms in this Gospel : "O $\tau \iota$, as often, introduces the exact words of the speaker.
 it is who hath built for us the synagogue.' This was not unusual in an individual. The person was, no doubt, a proselyte.
 come]', which last words are to be supplied from what follows.
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#### Abstract

18. Búo $\tau i v a s$ ] The $\tau t s$ indefinite is simply used with a numeral at Acts $x$ xiii. 23. \& xix. 14. And the Philologists think that the addition of the $\tau$ ts renders the number indefinite; which is frequently the case in the Classical writers; and the $\tau$ ts may be there expressed by our some; but whether it has that force in the N. T., I doubt. It is unsuitable to the sacred writers, and can hardly have place in numbers so small as two. Besides, Matthew mentions positively turo. It rather seems to have the usual sense certain: q. d. certain persons, two in number. 21. еӨєра́тєєбе] This is not well rendered ' cured,' or 'was curing.' It should rather seem that the Aorist is put for the Pluperfect, as often in narration; as Mark iii. 10. 21. עó́cov каі цабт. каl тข. т.] Here we see damoniaral possession studiously distinguished from disorders, and that by a Physician. The disorders are also distinguished into the ordinary,  the more grievous and painful ; ( as Mark iii. 10. \& v.29. and Ps. $x \times x i i .10$.) so called, because such were regarded as peculiar scmurges from God. 'E日epázevae is used propric̀ of the עóvos and $\mu \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \iota$ cs , and impropriè of the dispossessions. Indeed in that case there was almost always a disorder cured at the same time that a demon was


ejected. 'Exapioaro т. $\beta$., 'he bestowed sight;'
literally, freely bestowed.' An elegant use, hinting, as Doddr. suggests, the kindness and benevolence of our Lord. With this the Commentators have compared several passages of the Classical writers. The rd, which is omitted in several MSS., and which some Editors are inclined to cancel, is very necessary to the sense. Td $\beta \lambda$. signifies the faculty of sight;
 recent Commentators supposed to mean dress, to which it is sometimes applied in the Classical writers, as in Eurip. Phoen. 1505. orod coa крокóe $\sigma \sigma a \nu$ àveī $\alpha$ т $\rho \cup \phi \bar{\alpha} s$. Thus it would stand for tpuфধрш.. That, however, would be too poetic for plain prose, and there is no reason to abandon the interpretation luxury, a lururious life. Thus in a kindred passage of Artemid. iii. 60. тois $\frac{\epsilon}{v}$ т $\rho \cup \phi \bar{\eta}$ ठtáyovat. The $\dot{\text { virapx. }}$ must be accommodated in sense to each of the nouns with which it is connected. See also 2 Pet. ii. 13. Besides, both circumstances are necessary to designate the luxurious. See Luke xvi. 19.
29. Ėıкaico $\alpha \alpha \nu$ ] On the signification of this word the Commentators are not agreed. The version 'honoured,' 'obeyed,' and others, are but paraphrases. And the sense' acknowledged him

















to be just' is harsh. It is best to suppose a significatio pragnans, and to adopt the primary sense, that espoused by many of the best Commentators, acknooledged and commended the justice of God (i.e. of his purpose in calling them to repentance by John) and were baptized. This interpretation is, as I observed in Recens. Synop., required by the antithetical formula in the next verse, тї̀ $\beta_{0}$ ұ̀ $\theta$ étronav \&c.
This and the following verse have been by most Commentators considered as coming from the Erangelist, not Jesus. If so, they must be placed in a parenthesis. But Grot. ${ }^{2}$ Campb., and others bave, I think, satisfactorily proved that they are the words of our Lord. As to the words elme $\delta \dot{d} \dot{\delta}$ Ḱupos, they are not found in all the best MSS, and nearly every Version, and are justly cancelled by all the best Editors. I would render the passage thus: 'And now the great body of the people who have heard him, and even the publicans, have acknowledged and fulfilled the purpose of God, by being baptized by John : but the Pharisees and Lawyers have set at naught the purpose of God, having not been baptized by John. Els ciauroús is by some interpreted 'against themselves,' 'to their own injury.' But although this sense of els is supported alike by Classical and Scriptural authority, and is here agreeable to the context, it is better, with Camer., Grot., Hamm., Wolf, Whitby, Wets., Campb., Rosenm., and Kuin., to suppose a slight transposition, and connect cis $\dot{\text { éautous with } \beta o u \lambda \dot{j} \nu \text { тoù } \theta e o \bar{u} \text {, in the sense }}$ 'in regard to themselves.' This use of eis is very frequent. See the Lexicons.
37. кal ldovi, yuvì \&cc.] It has been a much disputed question whether this story be the same with that narrated at Matth. xxvi. 6. Mark xiv. 3. Joh. xii. 3., or not. The former is maintained by some antient and most early modern Commentators, especially Lightf. and Grot. But the latter has been established by Theophyl. and

Euthym. (from Chrysost.), and by many of the best modern Commentators, as Buxt., Hamm., Whitby, Wolf, Markl., Michaelis, Rosenm., Kuin., Deyling and Lampe, (the substance of whose lengthy arguments may be found stated in Recens. Syn., the former on this passage, and the latter on Joh. xi. 1.) The points of dissimilarity between the two narrations and between the Mary here mentioned and Mary Magdalene, it will be seen, are striking. As to the similarity, the action (anointing) was not unusual, the name of the vessel common, and the name of the Pharisee one of those most frequently met with. This is quite independent of the sense to be assigned to $\dot{\alpha} \mu a \rho \tau \omega \lambda \dot{s}$, whether sinner, or Gentile. Of the latter sense I cannot find any one undoubted example in the singular; and even with the plural it requires the Article, unless united with reגcival. Though, therefore, that interpretation may have been adopted by several good Commentators, the former, which is espoused by most Commentators, is greatly preferable. But when they assign to the word the sense harlot, or adultress, they adduce no proof of that signification from the Classical writers. I therefore see no reason why it may not be taken in the general sense of a sinful person ; in which signification the singular is frequent, e. gr. Luke v. 8.
 get rid of the harshness of taking गु $\nu$ in a pluperfect tense, (very rarely met with) which all Commentators invariably do, who assign to d $\mu a \rho \tau-$ whós the signification harlot. It may retain its usual force, and denote that the woman was then a sinner. She was, however, it seems, a sinner under conviction of sin, and having the sincere desire of amendment.
38. $\sigma \tau \bar{a} \sigma a \dot{\delta} \pi i \sigma \omega 0$ ] Jesus, it seems, was reclining at table on a couch, leaning on his left elbow, his head and countenance turned towards the food, and his naked feet (the sandals being taken of before the meal) turned the contrary way, towards which the servants bearing the
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dishes were waiting on the triclinium or table． （Maldon．\＆Kuin．）
－катєфìєl］The ката is intensive；and the action implied the deepest reverence and most profound humility，（See the examples from the Classical writers in Recens．Synop．）as the bathing his feet with her tears did earnest suppli－ cation．The anointing of the feet was a mark of profound respect，retained even in modern times．

39．т $\rho o \phi \eta \tau \eta s$ i．e．a Divine legate，and con－ sequently endued with supernatural knowledge．
 more elegant mode of expression；but the other is more pointed．

44．This and the following verses advert to the custom in use among the Jews to guests，who were made very welcome．1．Their sandals were unloosed，and their feet washed and carefully wiped，and，if the person were of high rank， anointed．2．A kiss was the usual salutation on entrance，or as soon as the person was made comfortable．3．The head was usually anointed with aromatic oils or unguents．Tins кєфа入 $\bar{\eta} s$ is omitted in many MSS．and Versions，and has been cancelled by Griesb．，Vat．，Scholz．，and others；but on insufficient grounds．The MSS． are comparatively few；Versions are，in a case like the present，no sure testimony；and better reasons may be given for its omission than for its insertion．
45．$\left.\epsilon \sigma^{2} \bar{j} \lambda \theta o \nu\right]$ The chief Editors and Com－ mentators agree in preferring eloñ$\lambda \theta \epsilon \nu$ ，which is the reading of some MSS．and Versions．The evidence，however，for it is so slender that，small
as the difference is，an Editor would not be warranted in receiving it，especially as it cannot be proved that the common reading must be wrong；for we have only to regard the language as partaking of the same hyperbolical cast，which is so characteristic of Oriental phraseology．Be－ sides，it is probable that the woman came in very soon after our Lord was seated，and thus supplied those observances which Simon had neglected． Indeed，there is something feeble in the sense of ci $\sigma \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta \in \nu$ ．That cloñ $\theta$ ov is as proper in grammar as eloĵ入өey，is plain from a kindred passage of Liban．which I have cited in Recens．

 $\beta e \lambda \eta$ ．
－oú סıèıтєє катафı入ō̄бa］On the Parti－ ciple for Infinitive after verbs signifying repeated action see Winer＇s Gr．Gr．$\$ 39$ ． 1.
 Commentators are not agreed．The antient and early modern ones take it to mean for，or be－ cause．But many of the best of the more recent Commentators regard this as repugnant to the scope of the parable；which，they say，represents the gratuitous forgiveness of sins as the cause of the love，not the love，the cause of the forgiveness， which，they further remark，is at ver． 50 ．ascribed． And they render the $\delta$ ot therefore．The proofs， however adduced of this signification are very insufficient；and therefore it is better，with others，（as Parkhurst）to suppose that the öt denotes an inference from the antecedent to the consequent，＇Wherefore［since she has shown so







 55， 56.












great a regard for me］I say unto you［it is plain that ］her many sins are forgiven，for，or because， she loved much．＇This method，however，is open to much objection，and the antient inter－ pretation，after all，appears to be the best．As to Campbell＇s objection，it has no force，because the thing admits of two handles．And as to this interpretation representing love as the meritorious cause of the remission of sins，that is not very valid；for although faith is afterwards said to have saved her，yet as it was faith working by fervent love and veneration for her Lord，the latter might be said，in a popular sense，to be the cause of her salvation．The sense of $\eta^{\prime} \gamma^{\prime}-$ rทre no入̀ may be expressed by＇inasmuch as she hath given full evidence of her love and attachment．＇Now that implied faith in the Messiahship of Jesus．
－al ォo入入al］Sub．oūซat，which is expressed in a similar passage of Philostratus Vit．Ap．
 ourcov．

48．$\alpha \phi$ ćcovtai $\sigma o v$ ai $\dot{\alpha} \mu$ ．］＇thy sins are（here－ by）forgiven thee．＇Many Commentators say that this is doubtless a repetition of the conso－ latory assurance which Christ had on some pre－ vious occasion given to the woman．But this may be considered utterly unfounded．We have merely a formal pronunciation of that forgive－ ness which the foregoing words implied．So


VIII．1．＾ateそn̄s\} Sub. xpóvc̣.
－катá жòเv］Wets．rightly distinguishes between this expression and катai Tiv Tó入ıv， the latter being said of one，the former of more than one．In fact，the кati has the distributive sense，which takes place not only in numerals，
but also in words which are not so，by an ellipsis， as the Grammarians think，of ëкаотоs．

2．Mayda ${ }^{\delta} \nu \eta$ i］．The best Commentators are agreed，that there is no authority in Scripture for supposing this Mary to have been a harlot；nay it should seem that she was a person of conse－ quence．＇$E \xi \in \lambda \eta \lambda u ́ \theta \epsilon \iota$ ，＇had been expelled．＇ Neut．for passive，as often in the Gospels and Acts．E．V．and Campb．have，＇out of whom went，＇\＆c．；which is altogether wrong．Better is the version of Newcome，＇had gone．＇But in all the examples of this signification there is evidently a passive sense．Many recent Com－ mentators take the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \alpha$ as signifying＇many，＇ definite for indefinite，as in Matt．xii．45．\＆ xii．26．But that idiom is not to be introduced unnecessarily；and here it is not very suitable．

3．$\dot{e \pi} \iota \tau \rho$ ónov $^{2}$ The Commentators are not agreed on the exact office designated by ḋitpo－ ros，which as it denotes generally one who has an office committed to his charge，is of very ex－ tensive signification，and may denote Guardian， or Lieutenant of a province，or Treasurer，or house or land steward，agent and manager．So
 dypois．Thus our steward comes from the Icel． and Ang．Sax．stie or stew（work）and ward，a guardian，overlooker．
3．סıๆкóvovv］＇supplied with the necessaries of life ；＇as Matth．iv．11．xxvii．35．Mark i． 13. xv．41．This signification occurs also in Theophr． Char．ii．4．For aúrē a great number of MSS． and many Versions have aurois，which is edited by Matth．and Scholz．But both external and internal evidence are rather in favour of the common reading．
8．eis］This reading（for $\dot{i \pi i}$ ）is，fropl＿in
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[^12]15．ка入yิ кal dya0̂̄］Beza and Grot．regand this as an expression er adytis Philosophiae：and they compare the expression of the Classical wri－ ters $\kappa a \lambda d s \kappa \alpha \dot{\alpha} \alpha \theta \delta$ s as said of one who is endowed with all the advantages of body，mind，fortune， \＆c．But the expression here simply designates ＇thoroughly good heart，＇the кa入 $\hat{y}$ being used merely with reference to the thing compared， namely，the ground just before．Karéxuva， ＇keep in mind，＇＇lay to heart．＇＇ $\mathbf{E \nu}$ vтоиоу is by some rendered＇，with patience；＇by others， ＇with perseverance．＇Both senses may have place．
 Commentators imagine）redundant here，and perhaps in very few of the many passages which they adduce．Luke has expressed something more than Matthew and Mark，and it is this，that what he yet retains is likely to be so soon lost that he can hardly be said to have it．
20． $\boldsymbol{d}_{\pi \eta \gamma \gamma e ̀ \lambda \eta-\lambda \epsilon \gamma о ́ v т i o n] ~ M o s t ~ C o m m e n-~}^{\text {－}}$ tators supply $\tau \iota \nu \bar{\omega} \nu$ or $\alpha u \boldsymbol{u} \omega \bar{\omega}$ ．But the construc－ tion of Ablative absolute is here harsh，and it should rather seem that $\alpha \boldsymbol{\alpha} \delta$ is to be fetched from

Kt．VIII．

 aủtóv．




























[^13]the sailors．Examples are found in the best writers．The same idiom extends also to houses，as in Virgil ：＂Jam proximus ardet Uca－ logon．＂

24．$\tau \underset{\varrho}{ } \times \lambda$ údouvt $\tau$ ．U．］the dashing surge．
27．drip $\tau: s{ }^{d} \kappa$ т $\bar{j} \mathrm{~s} \pi$ ．］a person of the city； as Matt．Xxvii． 37.
29．то入入oī xpóvots］Grot．and Rosenm．take this for mo八入dкis．But as in ver．27．we find
 take xpovois for annis，inde a pluribus annis． And indeed that sense is frequent in the Clas－ sical writers，and sometimes occurs in the Sept． Loess．cites Did．Sic．xiv．A．and Wets．Plat．
 add $\eta$ xpóvous．To which may be added Thucyd．
 $\mu \nu \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta} \eta$ ．
31．Tiv $\left.{ }^{2} \beta v \sigma \sigma o \nu\right]$ scil．$\chi \infty j \rho a \nu$, i．e．Tartarus， that part of Hades in which the souls of the
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wicked were supposed to be confined. So 2 Pet i. 14. Apoc. xx. 1. See Schleus. Lex. So also Eurip. Phœn. 1632. Taptd́pov ¿ß́̈́ббov Xáбмата.


Classical as well as the Scriptural writers.
42. $d \pi \in \theta \nu \eta \sigma \kappa e \nu]$ 'was (as it were) dying;' 'was near unto death.' इuvéxvcyoy, for ouvé$\theta \lambda_{\iota} \beta o v$, which is used by Mark.
43. où $\sigma \alpha \dot{d} \nu \dot{\rho} \dot{v} \sigma c t]$ This use of etvat with $d v$ as applied to disorders, occurs elsewhere in Scripture. We may compare the du0poros dy
 case the iv is for ơy. For els larpous, latpois is found in almost all the best MSS., and is adopted by all Editors from Wets, to Scholz.
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#### Abstract

51. eife $\left.\lambda \theta_{\infty}^{\circ}\right]$ Many MSS. have $\lambda \lambda \theta \omega \nu$, which is received by Wets., Griesb., and Scholz. Kal  'I क'ayy.) is found in all the best MSS. and Versions, the Edit. Princ., and Theophyl., and is edited by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholy, who are probably right in so doing, as the mistake might easily arise from the кal-кal. Yet the common reading might be defended on tenable grounds. 52. غко́лтоуто aúтív] 'bewailed her.' Kо́ттeodat properly signifies to beat or strike oneself, and then, because that is the usual accompaniment of extreme grief, to bewail, grieve for any one. It answers to the Heb. 7 DD , which is followed by ל, for, or by, over, and has sometimes in the Sept. (as here), like a deponent, simply an Accusative. 54. ทं $\pi$ aîs] Nomin. for Vocat., which occurs also at vi. 25. x. 21. xii. 32. xviii. 11. and Mark v. 41 ., and sometimes in the Classical writers, especially the Attic ones. IX. 1. $\mu a \theta \eta r a ' s$ aüroī] These words are omitted in very many of the best MSS., several Versions, and some Fathers, and are cancelled by almoat every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. Some MSS. and those Versions which have not $\mu a \theta$. auroù have áxобтóגove aúroū. Nothing therefore can be plainer than that both are from the


margin. The elliptical expression of $\delta \infty \cos ^{\circ} \delta \mathrm{ck} \alpha$ for the twelve Apostles, is frequent in the N.T., and there are generally some MSS. in which is added
 words are confirmed by Matth. x. 1. But it is more probable that they have been introduced from thence. Better reasons may be imagined for their insertion than for their omission. I cannot but here animadvert on the bad criticism and disingenuous spirit evinced by the supporters of the system, which regards the Dæmoniacs as merely lunatics. For though dæmoniacs and lunatics would in this verse seem to be as plainly distinguished as words can make them; yet the party in question (as, for instance, Kuinoel) seek to neutralize this by foisting an alios in their versions, as if $\alpha \lambda \lambda$ ous were found in the text.
 is said, that he gave them power to cast out dæmons and to heal disorders. In this the sense is, that they had a commission to go forth and exercise their power, in conjunction with the preaching of the Gospel Dispensation.
3. $\dot{\rho} \alpha^{\prime} \beta$ dovs ] Many MSS. have $\dot{\rho} \dot{\alpha} \beta \delta o v$, which is preferred by almost all the recent Editors. See Note on Matt. x. 9. Avi, a-piece. So Matt. xx. 9. €ौaßov dvaं ठ̀ $\nu \lambda \alpha \rho t o v$. and Joh. ii. 6. dvá $\mu е т \rho \eta t a ̀ s$ dío $\eta$ т $\rho e i ̄ s$. On this distributive sense, see Matth. Gr. Gr. §579. 3. The Commenta-
 5. ${ }_{\text {1L }} \mathbf{1}$ Act 10. 1.1 et 18. 6. кal fov кои,


m Matt14.






 au'тóv.
n Matt. 14.
${ }^{13}$ Narc. 6.30, Marc. 6.30,
$31,32$.











tors and Grammarians, however, seem wrong in supposing that the numeral belongs to the $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\nu}^{\prime}$. It is rather to be referred to the verb; and the preposition is to be taken as put aboolutely, thus becoming an adverb, by an ellipsis of íкaбтov, which is sometimes expressed and very frequently тãs. Our a-piece, for at piece, exactly corresponds to the $\alpha \nu \dot{ }$ íkaorov. The passage of


- exect) This is regarded as Infin. for Imperat. Exere; a not unfrequent idiom, to lessen the harshness of which Philologists generally suppose an ellipse of an Imperative of wish, or of dei. It is better, with Herm. on Vig. p. 591 ., to suppose the idiom to be a relique of antient simplicity of language, when a wish was expressed simply by a verb in the Infinitive. Of this there is a confirmation in the use of the Hebrew verb. The principle, however, cannot apply to the phraseology of later Greek writers, especially prose writers. It will usually be found that the Infinitive has a reference to some verb which has preceded, and to which the writer, inadvertently, accommodates the construction. Thus the idiom falls under the head of Anantapodoton; e. gr. here éxecy is used as if aipect (referred to sinc, bade) had preceded, and not al̆pete.

5. кal тд̀v коעto $\frac{1}{2} \nu$ ] Kal , even.
6. $\delta \iota \eta \pi o ́ \rho \epsilon t]$ ' he was in doubt and perplexity,' namely, what to think.
7. тólecos」'belonging to the city.' Or mò. may denote the district of Bethsaida.
 compounds are often used with ${ }^{\eta} \lambda 1$ os of the declination of the sun to the horizon. Sometimes, as here, $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a$ is used instead of $\tilde{\eta}^{n} \lambda$ cos. At tas
 ellips. is frequent in the Classical writers. "Iva
 or lodgings; ' as xix. 7. and Gen. xxiv. 23. (Sept.) This signification of the word is derived (like that of our stage for stayage) from travellers unloading their beasts and ungirding themselves.
8. i $\chi \theta \dot{e}$ es $\delta \dot{v}$ o $]$ This, instead of dío $i x \theta \dot{e}$ es, is found in a very great number of MSS., and is received by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Knapp, and Scholz.

- el $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau \iota$ ] There is here some obscurity, the sense being not fully developed. Hence Bera, Grot., Pisc., and Wolf suppose an ellipsis of ov סuvaтdv dovi, or où duyápe 0 a. But this is so harsh, that Kypke, Kuin., and others seek to remove the difficulty by taking el $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \tau$ for num quid, and making the sentence interrogative. For that signification, however, they adduce no suff. cient authority. We must therefore adhere to
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the usual one of el $\mu \dot{\eta}$, unless, and suppose, with the Syriac Translator, Casaub., Valckn., Schleus., and Wahl, that the $T$ h has what Hoogev. calls the ris oroxaotisi, and signifies fortasse, or perhaps forsooth. The Apostles, through delicacy, do not fully express their meaning, which seems to have been this: "We have no more than, \&c. unless forsooth we should go and purchase [sufficient food] for all this multitude.' The ellipse is by no means harsh, nor unknown in our own language.

14. к入เซias] Sub. кara. The word is very rare in the Classical writers, but is found in Josephus.
15. катацо́vas] 'apart (from the inhabitants of the country),' in private.
16. $\delta \Pi$.] The $\dot{\delta}$ is omitted in many good MSS., and is cancelled by Matth. and Scholz.
17. каӨ' $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\rho} \rho a y$ ]. The Editors and Critics are in doubt whether this expression be genuine, or not. It is rejected by Wets., Matth., and Scholz,
but retained by Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., and Vat., external evidence is pretty equally balanced; the Alexandrian recension and almost all the Versions having it, and the Constant., with some few Versions, and Chrys. and other Fathers, being without it. Griesb. thinks it was cancelled by the librarii, as not being in the other Gospels. But he adduces no example of a similar curtailment from the same cause. Matthæi thinks it was introduced from the Fathers and Interpreters, who had perhaps in view 1 Cor. xv. 31. And of this he adduces some strong proofs. The latter view seems to be the best founded. It was not, however, I conceive, introduced direct from the Fathers or Interpreters. It was, no doubt, at first borrowed by the Scholiasts, and from them was marked in the margin of copies, from whence careless scribes introduced it into the text.
 cautov $\psi v x$ yv. Herodot. vii. 39. has tiv $\psi u \times$ xiv
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tors and Grammarians，however，seem wrong in supposing that the numeral belongs to the aid． It is rather to be referred to the verb；and the preposition is to be taken as put absolutely，thus becoming an adverb，by an ellipsis of énaनтov， which is sometimes expressed and very frequently жа̄s．Our a－piece，for at piece，exactly cares－ ponds to the diva＇ëкaorov．The passage of Mark vi．40．$\alpha \nu \alpha$＂̈кatdv．is of another nature．
－$\left.{ }^{\text {exccu}}\right]$ This is regarded as Infin．for Imperat． ¿xere；a not unfrequent idiom，to lessen the harshness of which Philologists generally sup－ pose an ellipse of an Imperative of wish，or of $\hat{6} \in \bar{\imath}$ ． It is better，with Herm．on Wig．p．591．，to sup－ pose the idiom to be a relique of antient simpli－ city of language，when a wish was expressed simply by a verb in the Infinitive．Of this there is a confirmation in the use of the Hebrew verb． The principle，however，cannot apply to the phraseology of later Greek writers，especially prose writers．It will usually be found that the Infinitive has a reference to some verb the has preceded，and to which the writer vertently，accommodates the construes the idiom falls under the head of $A r$ －．gr．here éxetv is used as if atp． eire，bade）had preceded，and no

5．val adv коעเорт $\delta \nu$ ］K $\pi l$ ，e！

7．סเทтópet］＇he was in doubt and perplexity， namely，what to think．

10．mob $\lambda$ cw s 」＇belonging to the city：＇Or $\pi \dot{\partial} \lambda$ ． may denote the district of Bethsaida．
 compounds are often used with yin cos of the de－ clination of the sun to the horizon．Sometimes， as here，vi $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \rho a$ is used instead of $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime} \lambda c o s$ ．At mas
 ellis．is frequent in the Classical writers．＂Iva катa入úv wot，＇＇that they may seek кaтa入úpare or lodgings ；＇as xix．7．and Gen．xxiv．23．（Sept．） This signification of the word is derived（like that of our stage for stuyage）from travellers ult－ loading their beasts and ungirding themselves．

13．［X0́ves òvo］This，instead of òvo ixtúes，${ }^{25}$ found in a very great is received by Wets
Knapp，and Soche
－$\epsilon l \mu \dot{j} \tau \iota]$ T
sense being no ${ }^{*}$
Grot．，Misc．，
cuvarò $\begin{gathered}\text { é } \sigma \tau i\end{gathered}$
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the usual one of el $\mu \eta$ ，unless，and suppose， with the Syriac Translator，Casaub．，Valckn．， Schleus．，and Wahl，that the $\tau t$ has what Hoogev．calls the vis $\sigma \tau о \chi a \sigma \tau \iota x \eta$ ，and signifies fortasse，or perhaps forsooth．The Apostles， through delicacy，do not fully express their meaning，which seems to have been this：＇We have no more than，\＆c．unless forsooth we should go and purchase［sufficient food］for all this multitude．＇The ellipse is by no meang harsh， nor unknown in our own language．
14．к入ı ías Sub．кard．The word is very rare in the Classical writers，but is found in Jgari
as］＇apart（from the inhabitants
in private． in private． cancelled by Matth．and $y^{2 y^{7}-} \begin{gathered}\text { Editors and Critics are } \\ \text { vesion be genuine，or } \\ \text { Tath }\end{gathered}$ fatth．，and Scholz，
but retained by Griesb．，Knapp，Tittm．，and Vat．，external evidence in pretiy equally ba－ lanced；the Alexandrian recenxion and almont all the Versions having it，and the Conntant．， with some few Versions，and Chrya，and other Fathers，being without it．（irienb．thinkn it wan cancelled by the librarii，an not leing in the other Gospels．But he adduces no example of a similar curtailment from the name cause． Matthei thinks it was introduced from the Fa－ thers and Interpreters，who hal perhapt in view 1 Cor．xv．31．And of this he adductes some strong proofs．The latter view seema to be the best founded．It wan not，however，I conceire． introduced direct from the Fathers or laper－ preters．It was，no doubt，at first borrowed jot the Scholiasts，and from them wan marted ia $2 e$ margin of copies，from whence careless scr．ses introduced it imeo the text．
25．Ynuconocis Repeat iaurdy，in the iaurou woxiv．Heroditst vii． 39.
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Classical writers. Hence some have imagined that it here figuratively represents the contest our Lord was to maintain against the rebellious Jews on his advent at the destruction of Jerusalem. But this is neither warranted by the words nor permitted by the context. The best Commentators since the time of Grot. are agreed that $\varepsilon$ Egoos is here used to denote death; by a euphemism common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, and indeed found in every language, and which is justly considered among the allusions that have preserved that most antient of traditions, the immortality of the soul. "Eneyov, for d $\lambda$ á $\lambda$ ouv, 'were conversing of,' as in Mark iv. 32. Joh. vi. 7. viii. 27.
33. $\mu$ lay Mwoei] This, instead of Mmorei piav is found in almost all the best MSS. and Versions, with the Edit. Pr. ; and it has been, very properly, edited by Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz.

38. dvip $d \pi \delta$ toü $\%$.] 'a man out of the crowd,' i.e. one of the crowd assembled. 'Eri$\beta \lambda \psi_{o}$. Very many of the best MSS. have $d \pi$ Bגéqat, which is received by Matth., Griesb. Vat., Tittm., and Scholz.
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 by Math., Griesb., and Scholz.
41. To $\rho \delta \dot{v} \dot{\operatorname{san}}$ ] pud vas. Equivalent to the $\mu e \theta^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \mu \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ of Matthew. The same signification is found in Matt. xiv. 56. and Job. i. 1. Avé ${ }^{\prime}$ opal $\dot{u} \mu \cos y$, 'shall I bear with you.' This sense is requant in the N.T., and sometimes occurs in the Classical writers, though with the Accusative.
 found in almost all the best MSS., and the Ed. Pr., and is received by Math., Griesb., Vat., and Scholz.
 ness of God as manifested in Christ.' Merca-入etórys is a word almost appropriate to designating Divine power. So it is used in Acts xix. 27. of Diana; and in 2 Pet. i. 16. of Christ, thus showing Peter's belief in the divinity of our Lord.
44. $\theta$ é $\theta$-els res кapdias, which occurs in Luke xxi. 14. - Let these sayings sink into your ears,' i. e. attend to and lay them to heart.
45. "va $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ait.] The best Commentators are agreed, that iva is for wore, adeo ut, insomuch that, a very frequent sense. The sense is, 'And it was hidden to (i.e. obscure to) them, so that they did not understand it.' "They understood (says Kuin.) the words of Christ, but were at a loss how to reconcile them with their preconceived opinions ( founded on their own traditions) that their Messiah should live for ever, or with the great things they expected from him." "And therefore (says Whitby) in after ages they invented the distinction of Messiah Ben Joseph, who
was to die, and Messiah Ben David, who was to triumph and live for ever." Some recent Commentators have endeavoured (after Campb.) to revive the interpretation of the early Translators, who take "va in the ordinary sense to the end that, as expressing something intentional. And it is not to be denied that predictions were sometimes intentionally expressed darkly, so that they should be imperfectly understood. But that principle must not be unnecessarily obtruded. Campo. justly admits, that "if the Evangelist had employed an adjective (as коvтт ia) for the past participle, " ${ }^{2} \alpha$ might better have been interpreted so that." If, however, no better reason can be given for the other interpretation than that, it cannot stand; for what is so common as the use of a past participle for an adjeclive? Are there not hundreds of past participles in both the antient and modern languages used as adjectives, and a still greater number of adjectives which were once past participles, but have ceased to be such, and have become purely adjectives?
46. Td, Tic, \&cc.] This use of $\tau d$, in reference not to a noun, but to a sentence, or part of a senfence, is almost peculiar to St. Luke, though it occurs also in Matt. xix. 18. and Mark ix. 23. (Campo.) In fact, the neuter Article (to use the words of Winer, Gr. Gr. p. 54.) "stands before all propositions which are cited as proverbs, or maxims, or which on account of their importance require to be made distinctly prominett." $\Delta t a \lambda o \gamma t \sigma \mu d e$ d aürois, 'a discussion or dispute with each other.' 'By aurous for $\pi \rho d e$ a $\lambda \lambda$ in ${ }^{2}$ os.
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49. $\tau \dot{d}]$ This is omitted in very many MSS. and the Ed. Pr., and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz. But the case is doubtful; for Critical reasons may be adduced both ways. 'Aкo入ov日 $\bar{i} \mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime} \dot{\eta}^{\mu} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$. The sense is, ' does not belong to our company of disciples,' ' is not our fellow disciple.' The phrase was formed from the custom of the Jewish Doctors, like that of the Greek Philosophers, of being accompanied by their disciples wherever they went.
 $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \tilde{\sigma} \theta a t$, when used of time, denotes such a completion of a period between two given times as that the latter is filly come. So also in Acts ii. 1. On the sense of $d \nu a \lambda \dot{r} \psi \in \cos$ the Commentators are not agreed. Some take it to signify a removal, others a lifting up, i. e. on the cross. Both interpretations seem inadmissible. The true one is, no doubt, that of the Syr. and Arab., Euthym., Beza, De Dieu, Grot., and others down to Rosenm., Kuin., Schleus., and Wahl, who take it to refer to our Lord's ascension into heaven. The word, indeed, does not elsewhere occur either in the N.T. or the LXX.; but the verb $\dot{\alpha} \nu a \lambda a \mu \beta \dot{\nu} \nu e \iota v$ is often used to denote Christ's ascension, ex. g. Mark xvi. 10. Acts i. 2. ii. 22. 1 Tim.3. 16. And dyá $\lambda \eta \psi$ is occurs in Test. xii. Patr. in Fabric. Cod. Pseud. i. p. 585. and in the name of a Treatise, $d \nu \alpha \lambda \eta \psi$ ı $\mathrm{M} \omega \sigma \dot{\in} \omega \mathrm{s}$. Also in 2 Kings ii. 11. of the translation of Enoch. Thus Luke speaks of the departure of our Lord and his assumption into heaven, (which is denoted by the dya'), by a term derived from the most splendid circumstances attending the former. $\Sigma \nu \mu \pi \lambda$. is taken populariter, by an idiom which speaks of an event as come, when it is very near.

- тd $\pi$ póanatov a. EovipipıE] This is best
explained as a Hebraism formed from השים פמים, which often in the Sept. denotes to firmly determine and resolve. So the Pers. Vers. has 'positum firmum fecit.' Valckn., ' firmiter animo destinavit.'
 This phrase is Hebrew. So in 2 Sam. xvii. 11. ,פניך הלכים בקרבו, which is rendered by the
 $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \varphi$ aivḕv. The sense therefore is, 'when they knew that he was travelling to Jerusalem.'

54. $\dot{d} \nu \alpha \lambda \bar{\omega} \sigma a i]$ to destroy. This signification is common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, and is applied to destruction by fire, also in Gen. xli. 30. Numb. ix. 38. Jer. i. 7. Ez. v. 12. On the wide difference between the case adverted to by the Apostles and their own, see Grot. and Whitby. As $\pi \bar{v} \rho$ is here used of lightning, so is the Heb. אש, and the Latin ignis.
55. oùk oizart-є̈cte] Most recent Commentators take this sentence interrogatively, rendering 'know ye not with what spirit and disposition ye ought to be actuated [as my disciples] ?' The antient and the earlier modern ones take it declaratively. 'Ye know not with what disposition ye are actuated [and whither it would hurry, you]', ' ye do not consider the impropriety of it. The latter interpretation is preferable; for the former does some violence to the words by making dore mean 'ye ought to be.' The words in question are omitted in many MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and are suspected by some Editors not to be genuine; but without sufficient cause. Far more suspicion attaches to the next clause, which is not found in very many MSS., and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., and Scholz.
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56. «ंтота́そaб0 at тois, \&c.] Heins. and Doddr. apply the words to the man's possessions, supposing an ellipse of crijuart; and they take the sense to be, 'to arrange and settle $m y$ affairs.' But the phraseology would thus be unprecedented. the common interpretation, by which toil cis toy oikov is taken for toil olnciots, is, no doubt, the true one. And of the sense to bid fareurell in $\alpha \pi \sigma r$. abundant examples have been adduced by Kypke.
 couched under a figure derived from the ploughman, who must keep his eyes intent on his work, and not permit them to be turned away to any other object, otherwise his labour will be useless. See Hesiod. Op. D. ii. 61. and Theocr. Id. 10 .
 of undertaking any work. The dंगódoots (as Grot. remarks) is here (as often) mingled with the comparison. Turning buck implies inattension, and preference to some other employment than that we are engaged in. Similar is the Pythagorean maxim in Simplic. on Evict. 332. cited by Grot. els To lepdע dine - itiotpéqou.
X. 1. d́védeç̧v-кal étépous] 'appointed seventy others also,' or 'besides (the Apostles).' Some few MSS.. Versions, and Fathers read
$\dot{\text { e }} \boldsymbol{\delta}$. dóo. But their evidence is comparatively slight; and 1 suspect that the $B$ was derived from the K following. Those two letters are in MSS. written in the uncial character frequently confounded. Some, however, are of opinion that 70 is a round number for 72 , the number, they say, of the Elders selected by Moses as his colleagues in the government of the people, and of the Jewish Sanhedrin, as also the Translators of the Sept. But in the first case seventy was the number; and of the rest there is reason to think that not 72 , but 70 , was the real number.
57. $\left.\delta \kappa \beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \eta\right]$ This, for $d_{n} \beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \eta$, is found in very many MSS. and the Ed. Pr. and other early Fid., and is received by almost all Editors from Math. to Scholz. On the sense of $d_{x} \beta$. see Note on Math. ix. 38.
58. izá here] This is a formula of dismission.
59. $\left.\mu \dot{\eta}-\alpha \sigma_{\pi} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \eta \sigma \theta \epsilon\right]$ i. e. do not indulge in merely complimentary or courteous address.
60. $\mu$ èv] This is omitted in most of the antient MSS., and in several Versions and Fathers, and the Ed. Pr., together with almost all the other early Edd., and is cancelled by Wets., Math., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. It was probably inserted to complete the apodosis. 0 velds ciprivis. The Article is omitted in almost all the best MSS., some Fathers, and nearly all the

 Matt 10.
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 Act 13.51 . et 18.6















early Ld. I suspect that it crept, by an error of the press, into the fifth Edition of Erasmus, and consequently was introduced into the third of Stephens, where it certainly is found. Therefore it could not, as some imagine, be a mere conjecture introduced by Beza. It is true he accounted the Article as indispensable; in which he is so far mistaken, that the Article can by no means be tolerated, this being one of those numerous cases in which vids (by Hebraism) is put before a Genitive to indicate the relation of possession, or resemblance, participation, \&cc. as I Juke xvi. 8. viol tout alồos toútov. Matt. xxiii. 15.
 \&rc. See more in Wahl in v. §3. In not one example is the Article found. It is truly remarked by Middlet., that " the regimen will not endure the Article." The sense here is, 'one deserving of your blessing.'

 sense is, " [And this ye may freely do,] for the labourer is worthy of his hire;' as much as to say, 'ye will earn your support by your labour for the spiritual good of your hosts.' Mi j Meta-Baiveтє-olкiav, literally, 'do not change your lodgings by going from house to house.'
 off for you,' i. e. we return it back, to you; a form of giving up all intercourse. ' $\mathbf{E} \phi$ ' $\dot{\boldsymbol{j} \mu \overline{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{s} \text {. }}$ Almost all Commentators take this to mean, ' against you,' 'to your harm.' But that sense cannot be admitted. All that is meant seems to
be this, that the same solemn message is to be delivered to them, whether they will hear, or whether they will forbear. Render, - But (or however) know ye this (i. e; receive this our testimony) that the kingdom, \&c. Griesb. and others cancel the $\bar{\epsilon} \phi$ ' $\dot{\boldsymbol{i} \mu \hat{\alpha} s \text {, from some MSS. }}$ The authority, however, of those MSS. is but slender; and even a far greater number would not suffice; since the words were, no doubt, omitted from the difficulty of explaining them.
61. $8 \ell$ ] This is omitted in very many MSS., most of them antient, and several Versions and early Fd., and is cancelled by Math., Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz. But the formula is almost always accompanied with some conjunction. And perspicuity here would require one.
62. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \sigma \dot{\alpha} \kappa \kappa \%-\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\eta} \mu \in \nu a t]$ This posture of mourning and repentance was in use not only among the Eastern, but the Western nations of antiquity. See Kypke in Recess. Syn.
63. è $\theta$ ecípouv tiv $\Sigma$., \&c.] The best Commentaters are agreed that this is a bold and figuralive mode of expression, anticipating the future triumph of the Gospel over the powers of darkness; and that, as being exalted to heaven imports widely spread dominion, so falling from heaven denotes a fall from eminence and power. A kindred expression occurs in Is. xiv. 12. See also Joh. xii. 31. 2 Cor. iv. 11. Ephes. vi. 12. Nor is it without example in the Classical writers. Thus Cicero Exist. Att. ii. says of Pompey "ex astris decidise.'
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#### Abstract

19. See Note on Mark xvi. 17. Some Commentators here recognize another figure expresside of safety from men as deadly in their hostility as serpents and scorpions. See more in Recens. Synop. Kal oúdèv-d dixon. An accumulation of negatives which is highly intensive.  The best Commentators are agreed that there is here an allusion to the methods of human polity, future life being represented under the image of a temporal mo八itevan, in which the names of citisens were inscribed in a book, from which were occasionally expunged the names of those persons who were thought unworthy, and who thereby lost the jus civitatis. The same image is frequent in the $O$. T., and sometimes occurs in the N.T.; nor is it rare in the Classical mritars.

M $\tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o v$ is omitted in very many MSS., Yersions, Fathers, and early Eld., and is cancelled by almost all Editors.  same rapturous expressions of praise and thanksgiving as on the return of the twelve Apostles from executing the same commission. See Note on Matt. xi. 25, 27. \& xiii. 16. 25. et seqq. See the Notes on a kindred natration in Matt. xxii. 36. On the present one see Grot., W hitby, and Doddr. 29. $\theta e \lambda \cos \nu \delta \iota \kappa$.] i.e. wishing to excuse himself from the imputation of not having attended to the Law he taught. "For the Pharisees (observes Guin.) wished to show that he had not proposed a slight, or easily solvable, question, but one of importance and difficult determinaton. Since $\pi \lambda_{\eta} \operatorname{lich}_{0}$ is a term of extensive application, he takes occasion, from that ambiguity, to put the question cal ais er $\sigma$ i you wingoion; Jesus, however, returns an answer quite contray to the expectation of the lawyer; and by teaching that (after the example of the Sametitan who had deserved so well of the Jew) even to strangers, foreigners, and enemies were to be extended the offices of humanity and kindness, he left the Pharisee nothing to answer." 30. نंто入aßळiv] Sub. Td े $\lambda \dot{\sigma} \gamma o \nu$, which ellipse is supplied in Herodot. iii. 146. Render, ' taking him up,' 'answering;' a signification common













both to the Scriptural and Hellenistical, and also to the Classical writers. So the Latin excipere and suscipere. It is well observed by Kuin., that in the best Classical writers the $\dot{\text { undonaßaiv }}$ joined to $\dot{\epsilon} \phi \eta$, when any one interrupts the speaker, and so answers him as to take exception at, reprehend, or at least circumscribe, or correct, any position laid down by the other; in which case the word is not redundant. Wakef. and Campo. connect $\alpha^{2} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s$ closely with $\alpha \pi d$ 'Isp., remarking, that the whole energy of the story depends on the opposition between the Jew and the Samaritan. But the transposition is very harsh, and indeed unnecessary ; since, considering how little Judæa was frequented by foreigners, it might very well be implied that a person travelling from Jerusalem to Jericho should be a Jew. He could not be a Samaritan, because Samaritans were never allowed to go to Jerusalem. Karé $\beta a t \nu \epsilon \nu$ has reference to the situation of Jericho as compared with Jerusalem, the latter being on a hill, and the former on low ground. Mepıríттeuy signifies 1. to fall on. 2. to happen upon, fall in with, generally of things, but sometimes of persons ; and almost always implying evil. The Commentators adduce examples both from the LXX. and the Classical writers.
30. oil kale éкdívayтes, \&c.] 'who after stripping and beating him. The phrase т $\lambda_{\eta \gamma a s}$ érifeinat is found also in Acts xvi. 23., and occasionally in the Fathers; but never in the Classical writers; so that it is supposed to be a Latinism formed from the phrase imponere plagas. Yet we find in 2 Maccab.iii. 26. mo $\lambda \lambda a s$
 the ordinary Greek form for the Attic $\eta \mu \iota \theta \nu \dot{\eta}$. Yet I suspect that it was the more antient form, and the other an Attic contraction.
31. кará $\sigma v \gamma \kappa v \rho i a v]$ 'by a chance.' The Classical writers not infrequently use rata бuvтuxiav; but never катá бuyкирíav; and indeed they scarcely ever use ouyкupia. Inspmuch that we might suppose it to be entirely Hellenistic, did it not occur several times in Hippocrates. Hence it appears to have been a very antient word, and the phrase cara ouyкvpica was probably early in use, but afterwards supplanted by kara ouyruxiav. Yet it maintained, it seems, a place in the popular phraseology even to the time of Eustathius.
31. $\left.\alpha \nu \tau เ \pi a \rho \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta_{\varepsilon \nu}\right]$ The exact sense of this term is not clear. It cannot well be that com-
monty assigned to it, ' passed by on the other or farther side,' i. e. by getting out of the road. Most recent Commentators consider the civet as pleonastic. But that is declining the difficulty. 1 should think, with Grot., that it might mean 'passed by going the contrary way,' i. e. from Jerusalem to Jericho. But that is forbidden by the кaré $\beta a \iota v e \nu$; neither would that circumstance le to the purpose. I would therefore take $\alpha \nu \tau$ here to mean over against, which, indeed, I believe to be its original sense, it being, no doubt, for $[\dot{\varepsilon} \nu]$ duct, from the old dive, whence the common term Évavtı. Thus the sense is, 'He past by right over against him,' and not at some distance off, as some travellers might do, for in such a desert as all that tract was, it is not likely that there should be any regular road. The term àvimapé $\rho$ хоцає occurs also in the LXX. once.
32. $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta \omega^{\circ} \nu$ cal low $\omega^{\prime} \nu$ ) The $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \theta \omega^{\prime} \nu$ is not redundint, but shows that the Levite did more than the Priest. The latter only cast a passing glance ; the former also went towards him.
 in Yen. Cyr. v. and Fichus. xxvii. 31., and signifying to apply bandages to hold down the lips of a wound. The use of oil and wine, both separately, and as a mixture, called olvè toy, is clear from the citations of Wets. from the ancient Medical writers. Here, however, they may be best understood as used separately, the wine to wash the wound and stanch the blood, the oil to allay the pain. The oil, which in that country is very generous, was, no doubt, intended for anointing ; and the antiquity of the custom of taking such on a journey is (as Schoetg. observes) shown by the case of Jacob in the O.T.

- KT $\bar{\eta} \nu o s]$ This corresponds to our general term beast, whether horse, mule, or ass. It was probably an ass. Пavб̇oXeîov, a public hostelry, such as are still known in the East by the name khan. The word is said to occur only in the later writers; yet I find something very much like it in Eschyl. Choeph. 649. इкотєเขóv* ©̈pa
 סóxols そévcov.

35. er $\kappa \beta a \lambda \infty \nu]$ ' having cast down, put down, or disbursed.' The two denaria were (as I have observed in Recens. Synop.) equivalent to two days' wages of a labourer. See Matt. xx. 9 . 'Exıue入eĩotat was a term appropriated to the nursing and care of the sick and wounded, as distinct from medical or surgical attendance.






















36. $\dot{\text { o }}$ тoningas-aíroū] 'he who rendered benevolence towards him.' A Hebraism. See Notes on Luke i. 58. \& 72 .
37. кшi $\mu \eta \nu$ т.] namely, Bethany. See Joh. xii. 1. In the phrase inodé $\chi$ ectai els oiko is implied hospitable entertainment. The words eis $\tau \dot{\text { d }}$ oikov are very rarely added in the Classical writers; yet in Hom. Od. xvi. 70. we have the equivalent phrase їтоо́хоиат otкц.
38. кai] also, i. e. as well as the disciples. IIapakatioaza, 'having seated herself.' That neither the phrase 'being seated at the feet of any one,' nor the use of this as a posture of instruetion, was unknown to the Greeks and Romans as well as the Jews, is clear from the citations adduced by Wets.
 to draw around, draw aside, draw out of course. Thus those are, by an elegant metaphor, said $\pi \epsilon \rho!\sigma \pi a \tilde{a} \theta a t$, who are distracted, and whose minds are drawn aside in various directions, by anxious cares. So Diod. Sic. p. 82. A. $\boldsymbol{d} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{1} \hat{\lambda} \lambda \boldsymbol{\theta}$
 viiu. 6, 7. Omni sollicitudine districtum.

Diakoveiv here denotes the preparation of the meal, and other services required by hospitality. Euyavtı入aß'є́ $\theta a s$ signifies to lend a hand with one, to help in any work.
41. Tvpßá'n] 'thou art troubled,' (or, 'thou, distractest thyself with) a multiplicity of cares.' Tupßáそ̧ety is said by some Commentators to properly signify to raise the mud. But it comes from Túp $\beta \eta$, which does not signify mud, but is equivalent to our old English Substantive a stir,

Ang. Sax. stour, which may be cognate with $\tau \dot{u} \rho \beta \eta$, turba. At all events, $\tau \dot{u} \rho \beta \eta$ comes from
 to stir, which stir or stur is the same word, for $\sigma$ is often prefixed to words, as тє́yos, $\sigma \tau \in \mathfrak{\gamma}$ os.
42. ©ivds] On the reference in this word the Commentators vary in opinion. Several antient and modern Interpreters suppose an ellip. of Вршілатоs, dish, in which sense $\mu \dot{\rho}$ ря occurs in Gen. xliii. 34. Thus they think that what is usually applied to the dishes of a meal, is here applied to divine knowledge. But such an ellip. as this, and that which they suppose after mo $\lambda \lambda \dot{a}$. viz. many things to eat, is quite unprecedented. In either case the regular ellip. is $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta$, or $\pi \rho \alpha^{\prime} \gamma$ $\mu a \tau a$, in the one, and $\mu \dot{f} \rho o u s$ or $\pi \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu a \tau o s$ the other. And thus the common interpretation is undoubtedly the true one, and (as Doddr. remarks) "this is one of the most important apothegms that ever was uttered." The passage is thus paraphrased by Grot.: ' Various and multiplied are the cares and occupations of this life; one thing there is, which (if we would be saved) is altogether and indispensably necessary to us; namely, the care of religion and piety, and the study of divine things.'

- $\mu \epsilon \rho i \delta a]$ Grot., Elsn., Kypke, and Kuin. have proved that $\mu$ 'pos here signifies business, or occupation; as in Xen.Cyr. iii. 3, 5. Anab. vii. 6, 25. So the Latin pars in Cic. Quint. Frat. So Julian p. 253. (cited by Elsn.) où $\mu \iota \kappa \rho \bar{a} s$ мepi-
 muneri profectus est Philosophus.
X 1 . 2. seqq. On the interpretation here sce














Note on Matt. vi. 9. segq. It is only necessary to advert to the marvellous omissions which are found in some MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and which are almost entirely adopted by Griesb. and other Editors. The words $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{\text { oे }} \dot{\text { è } \nu}$ тoĩs oíp. are not found in about 8 MSS., with the Vulg. and Pers. Versions. But that authority is too slender to claim any deference. The reason for the omission may be conceived, though it were vain to imagine reasons for all the innumerable alterations which were introduced by the Alexandrian biblical Aristarchs.

The words $\gamma \in \nu \eta \eta_{\eta} \dot{i} \tau \omega-\gamma \bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ are omitted in nearly the same MSS. and Versions as the preceding $\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$-oujpavois, and, of course, there is no greater attention due in this than in the former case. But the omission here cannot well be considered as otherwise than unintentional. And not only the very small number of MSS. (about 6) warrants us to suppose this, but there is a palco-graphical principle which will exceedingly increase the probability thereof, namely, that as this clause begins with 4 words, 2 of them the same, and the other 2 of the same termination
 gov, so it is likely that these each formed a line in the very antient Archetype or Archetypes, and thus (as in a thousand other cases) the scribes' eyes were deceived, and they inadvertently omitted the second of those clauses.

Again, the words $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\rho} \dot{u} \sigma \alpha \iota-\pi o \nu \eta \rho o u ̄ ~ a r e ~$ omitted in about the same number of MSS. and Yersions as the before mentioned clauses, with the addition of three or four others, and Origen, and are cancelled by Scholz also. Here the omission cannot be accounted for on the same principle as the $\gamma \epsilon \nu \eta \theta_{\eta} \tau \omega-\sigma o v$; yet the testimony is too weak, and the quarter whence it comes so suspicious as to destroy all confidence. And far more probable is it, that the words were omitted by the above mentioned critics for some speculative doctrinal reasons, than that in all the MSS. except about ten, the clause should have been introduced from Matthew. This last reason will also apply to the other omissions; especially as the doxology, which is found in almost all the MSS. of Matthew, is here found in not one. Is it likely that those who introduced three interpolations should all of them omit to introduce the fourth?
4. кal yà ${ }^{2}$ aürol, \&c.] These words may seem to confirm the interpretation of those who render the wis in Matthew vi. 10. by for, forasmuch as. But it is not necessary to resort to that sense; for there is no real discrepancy, since in Luke that duty is taken for granted as indispensable, which in Matthew is made the condition, or measure of the forgiveness which we implore. Thus there is, in fact, no discrepancy between 'Give us this day,' and - Give us day by day.'
5. Tis]. The best Commentators are of opinion, that $\tau t s$ is for elt $\tau t s$, as in 1 Cor. vii. 18. and James v. 13. Thus the sense would be, 'Should any one of you,' \&c. But this seems unfounded and I agree with Fritz. on Matth. p. 726. and Bornemann in loco, that the true sense in such cases is quisnam? where the interrogation; as Fritz. says, expresses "animi commot ionem;" though (as Bornemann remarks) in some passages referred to this idiom, we must call in the principle of a blending of two constructions. At elmp the proper construction is abandoned for another which is not unsuitable. Mecoyvkriov, ' at midnight.' On the Genit. indicating time when, see Matth. Gr. Gr. § 378 .
6. ${ }^{\prime} \xi \xi$ d $\delta$ oū] Valckn. and Campb. join this with $\pi$ aрреүє́veтo, and render, 'is come out of his road.' This sense, however, is forced, and the construction harsh; and it is better, with others, to connect тареуéveтo with тоós $\mu \mathrm{e}$; a very frequent construction, especially in Luke. The $\dot{\epsilon} \xi$ d $\delta \mathbf{\sigma u}$ depends on wiv understood, and the sense is, 'who is just come off a journey.'
7. cis Tiv кuitクリ] Newcome and Middl. would take кoit $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\nu}$ to mean bed-chamber. But for that signification there is no authority. The interpretation, in fact, was adopted, to avoid the difficulty of supposing that all were in the same bed, since кoit $\eta \nu$ has the Article. But that does not necessarily follow ; for the Article may here have the force of the pronoun possessive, and $\mu \in \tau^{\prime}$ ¿ $\mu о \bar{u}$ may mean, (as Pearce and Campb. render) 'as well as myself.' Els кoi $\tau \eta \nu$ is best rendered by our old adverb $a$-hed, (for at bed) though the idiom may, with Bornemann, be accounted for on the principle of a blending of two expressions for els tiv коiтиy тарŋ̈бay кal elनiv ह̀v aùry.
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 $\pi \nu \in \hat{u} \mu a$ ä̀ıเov тoîs aitoû̃ıv aùтóv；
















8．avaidetav］importunity which will not be repressed．
9．кáخ $\left.\omega^{\circ} \dot{u} \mu i \nu\right]$ The comparison is not à simili， but $\dot{a}$ majori，q．d．＇If the importunate teazer ob， tains so much from men，what will not he that offers up fervent and assiduous prayers obtain from his Father in heaven．＇

11．$\dot{\mu} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ ．］Many MSS．，Versions，and Fa－ thers prefix $\epsilon \xi$ ，which is adopted by Griesb．and Scholz．${ }^{\wedge} \mathrm{H}$ ，instead of el，is found in a great number of the best MSS．，in most of the Ver－ sions，several Fathers，and the Ed，Princ．，and is adopted by Wets．，Matth．，Griesb．，Tittm．， Vat．，and Scholz．The words are perpetually confounded in the MSS．，but the $\hat{\eta}$ is demanded by the context．

13．＇̇彑，oùpanoùj for oùpávoss，as often．By $\boldsymbol{\pi} \nu \in \bar{\mu} \mu \mathrm{a} \boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{\chi}$ to ${ }^{2}$ are meant the ordinary aids of the Holy Spirit．

14．к $\cos \phi \partial \nu$ ］This is said to be put by metony－ my ，for what causes deafness，as Mark ix． 25. But it may mean dumb，as often elsewhere． ＇E日aüyagay，＇expressed their admiration and approbation．＇

16．eऽทiтouv］Bornem．would read $\epsilon \xi$ ！ŋंтouv， which would indeed be more proper，but the vulg．is Hellenistic Greek．

17．кal oikos＿xixтet］Campbell＇s version， ＇one family is falling after another，＇yields an unsatisfactory sense，and irreconcileable with the parallel passages of Matth．and Mark．The com－ mon version well expresses both the sense and the construction．The sentence contains a pa－ rallelism；and（as Valckn．saw）dıapcp．in the former member is to be repeated，with an adaptation of gender，in the latter．This mode of taking the passage is confirmed by the pa－ rallel ones in Matthew and Mark，and is adopted by almost all the antient and the best modern Commentators，who illustrate the sen－ timent both from the Classical and Rabbinical writers．
20．дactúגce $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text {eoù }}$ A Hebrew and popular expression，signifying＇by Divine power．＇＂E－ $\phi \theta a \sigma \in \nu$ carries with it an adjunct notion of what supervenes with unexpected celerity．See Valckn．
21．$\dot{\text { I }}$ loxupos］The Article here falls under Middleton＇s canon，of insertions in Hypothesis． The force of it is＇he who［is］．＇Thus also $\dot{d}$ loxvoóтєpos is＇he who（is）stronger．＇The rea－ soning at ver．22．is，that when another attacks， conquers，and spoils any one＇s property，it is plain that the other is more powerful than he．
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 каi ídov̀, $\pi \lambda \epsilon i ̄ o \nu ~ ' I \omega \nu a ̂ ̀ \dot{\omega} \delta \epsilon$.






#### Abstract

22. Tå $\sigma x u ́ \lambda a]$ Many eminent modern Commentators take $\sigma \kappa$. to signify, 'effects,' corresponding to the $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon \bar{u} \eta$ of Matthew. This they confirm from the Heb. שלל, which, though it properly signifies spoil, often denotes goods, as in fisth. iii. 13. That sense, however, is not established on any Classical authority; nor, indeed, is it necessary to resort to it, since the common version spoils, denoting the goods made a spoil of, includes the other sense. 27. $\mu$ акарía, \&c.] With this exclamation, (coming, no doubt, from a mother) the Commentators compare several from the Classical and the Rabbinical writers. Koı $\lambda$ ia and maotol are put for $\mu \alpha \dot{\tau} \eta \rho$. 28. $\mu \in \nu 0 \overline{0} \nu \gamma \epsilon]$ 'imo vero, yea indeed,' as Rom. ix. 20. x. 18. Phil. iii. 8. So Futhym. explains it a $\lambda \eta \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ s. Mevoùvye is a stronger ex-


pression than $\mu \in \nu o \bar{u} \nu$, and is used at the beginning of a sentence, while the other is not. The $\boldsymbol{\gamma e}$ is used as in каiтo九 $\boldsymbol{\gamma \epsilon}, \boldsymbol{\mu \eta} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$, \&c.
33. els крúnтTทリ] Some Commentators suppose an ellip. of $\chi \omega \rho a y$. But as that is of slen. der authority, others take eis криттiv for dy криттஸ. . That, however, is not definite enough to suit the parallelism. More objectionable is the method adopted by those who suppose a feminine put for the neuter, Hebraicè ; especially as there is no good authority for the Hebraism. It is better, with others, as Valckn. and Schleus., to consider к $\boldsymbol{\rho} \dot{0} \pi \tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ as a substantive from $\kappa \rho u ́ \pi \tau \eta$, a vault, which occurs in Athenæus, and often in the later writers. Hence the Latin crypta, whence our croft. Thus крúxтŋע exactly answers to $\mu$ ódıov. The first mentioned method, however, may be the truest.



















36. Some Commentators recognize no little irregularity and tautology in this verse, which they attempt to remove by conjectures. But those, besides being unauthorized, are very inefficient. There is, indeed, no tautology; the latter clause being more fully explained by a reference to the To фéryos supra ver. 33. As to the irregularity, we have only a very usual blending of the comparison with the thing compared. On its applicaion Middlet. has well remarked, that "though nothing more than the body has been mentioned, the soul is the object which our Saviour has in view ; and to this, probably, by a tacit inference, the application is to be made. "In ver. 35 . (continues he) the analogy between external and internal light had been established: in the present, the complete illumination described in the concluding clause, though intended of the mind, is affirmed only of the body, the application, after what had been said, being supposed to be obvious." After all, however, the difficulty cannot be entirely removed without cancelling the first $\delta \lambda$ inv, which I agree with Bornem. was probeby introduced from the following clause by gloss.
37. dyése $\in \mathcal{V}$ ] This simply means 'he seated himself at table;' the word only denoting that reclining posture adopted at meals. 'Eス0 $\boldsymbol{\omega}$ signifies 'on entering,' i. e. immediately on entering; which is required by what follows, where the sense is meant to be strongly marked by
 the same as at Mark vii. 4. where see Note. It is passive for middle.
39. $\nu \bar{\nu} \nu$ ] In the interpretation of this particle, the Commentators generally run into the extremes either of regarding it as expletive, or pressing on the sense. It is best, with Schleus. and Wahl, to consider it as an affirmative particle, signifying, 'sane, profecto,' as in Acts xxii. 16.

So we sometimes use Now ! and aye, now! Bornem. takes it for eò nunc dilapsi estes. Guin. and others think there is a transposition of $\delta \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$, which they construe with $\alpha \rho \pi \alpha \gamma \bar{\eta} s$. But that is at variance with the context; and the passages adduced in proof are not to the purpose. We have only to suppose (with Bornem.) a brevity of construction, for $\tau \dot{d} \delta \dot{\varepsilon} \dot{\delta} \sigma \omega \theta e \nu \dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ой ka $\theta a-$
 pretation of Elsn. and Guin., however learned and ingenious, is too far-fetched, and depends too much on an insufficiently established sense of moteiv, to be received. The common interpretation (confirmed by Euthymius) by which Td er $\sigma \omega \theta e \nu$ (scil. $\mu$ épos) is taken to denote the body, and $\tau \delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$ the mind, bears, in its simplicity, the stamp of truth.
41. ta '̇עóvтa] The ancient and most modern Commentators consider this as an elliptical phrase, and supply $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha$ and $\chi \rho \eta j \mu a \tau \alpha$, in the sense 'according to your ability,' or your substance;

 have been adduced, and the ellip. is not unfrequant in ta suvaтá. Other Commentators, however, (as Raphel, Heum., Kypke, and Wets.) think that the sense would require ex twi evóv$\tau \infty \nu$. And they take $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ d̀óvтa to signify ' what is within the cup,' or dish, i.e. its contents, qed. ' Be not anxious about the outward part, [or its brightness] but rather attend to its contents, and do but give in alms therefrom, and then food and every thing else shall be pure to you.' Thus eौequoбúvŋv will be in apposition with and extgetical of ta dvóvтa. Upon the whole, this interpretation is so strongly confirmed by Matt. xxiii. 26. that it may probably deserve the proference. Thus $\pi \lambda_{\text {i }}$ may be rendered, 'But yea [rather].'
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43. Tous ajowarرoùs] The force of the Article may be thus expressed, ' the salutations [which are made] in the market places.' Sub. үєvouévous.
44. oidaб! $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ ] At this word the preceding $\pi 6 \rho t-$ татоüves is to be repeated. The sense is, 'The men who walk over know not [that they are walking over them].' We may paraphrase, ' Ye are as it were hidden tombs over which men walk unknowingly!
46. тайтa-ußpi̧cıs] Render, 'by so saying thou reproachest us also.' The voumol are supposed to have been in dignity superior to the үралиатеїs. On the double Accus. after форлi-乡ere, see Matth. Gr. Gr. \$ 413. Note 1. and Winer $\$ 25.2$. And on the Dative in $\pi \rho o \sigma q a v i-$ ere, see Matth. Gr. Gr. $\$ 394$. The construc-

47. ช̈ть olкодомеîтe] On the omission of $\mu e ̀ \nu$, see Matth. Gr. § 284. 4. Winer's Gr. § 13. 2.
48. öт $七-\mu \nu \eta \mu \in i ̄ a]$ Bornem. rightly renders, quod, dum majores vestri prophetas necarunt, vos horum monumenta instaurastis. And remarks that the Greeks often put a primary sentiment in the second place, and a secondary one in the first place in the sentence.
49. $\dot{\eta}$ бoфía $\tau 0 \bar{u}$ Өeoū] Several antient Commentators (as Euthym.), and some modern ones, as Brug. and Wolf, take this to mean the $\Lambda$ óyos, or Son of God, i. e. Christ himself, who is called in 1 Cor. i. 24. the wisdom of God. And this interpretation is strongly confirmed by the $\epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \omega^{\circ}$ of Matthew in the parallel passage. The same
is adopted by Dr. Burton in his Bampton Lectures, p. 364., who observes that there seems reason to conclude, that the Jews were in the habit of using the term uisdom in a personal sense. And this (he thinks) may explain why the Gnostics made Sophia one of their coons. Perhaps, however, that opinion is magis arguta quàm vera. And there is more reason to think, with the generality of modern Commentators, that $\dot{\eta}$ бoф $\boldsymbol{c}_{\text {a }}$ тoú $\Theta \in o u ̄$ is abstract for concrete for

 doctrine is compared to an edifice, which, when the key is taken away, becomes closed up and inaccessible. The sense is the same as Matt. xxiii. 13., i. e. you both reject the Gospel dispensation yourselves, and hinder others from embracing it. Matt. xvi. 19.
 sense see Note on Mark vi. 19. 'AтобтоматіKєiv is properly a Rhetorical term, and signifies to repeat memoriter, bring forward any thing from memory, or ex tempore. See Tim. Lex. Plat., and especially Suid. and Hesych. So $\lambda$ é:
 which numerous examples are given by Wets. Sometimes, however, it is used in an active or transitive sense, 'to make any one speak memoriter,' of which examples are produced from Plato 216. C. \& 217. A. This is plainly the sense of the word in the present passage. The Pharisees strove to draw from Jesus unpremeditated effusions, in order that they might catch
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up something hastily and inconsiderately uttered, whence they might elicit matter for public accusation.
54. kal] This is omitted in almost all the antient MSS., several of the Versions, and in the Ed. Pr., and almost all the early Edd., and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. It came, no doubt, from the margin.
XlI. 1. dv, oIs] Most Commentators interpret 'interea.' Thus there will be an ellip. of xporoos. But the true ellip., I conceive, is жp ${ }^{2} \gamma \mu a \sigma t$, 'during which proceedings.' Mupid $\delta \infty 01$ (as Kuin. observes) stands for an arceedingly great number, as often the Heb. 7. The idiom, however, is common to all languages. Ifeerov. This may be taken either with the preceding ijpEaro $\lambda$ é $\gamma \in e \nu$, or the following тробexere. The former construction is adopted by the earlier, and the latter by the recent Translators and Commentators. The Editors, almost without exception, point according to the former. Yet the latter seems by far the better founded,
and thus meñov signifies inprimis, as in Matt vi. 33. Rom. i. 8. iii. 2. and in Joseph. Ant. x. 10,5. трю̄тоע aùtoìs троनтd́धas.
 Edd. have dжоктеעóvicov, which is edited by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Vat., and Scholz. But there is no sufficient reason for the change. If any were made, I should prefer, with Bornem.,
 עúvroy. And as so many readings may be true, while it is difficult to prove which of them is the true one, it is better to adhere to the common text.
11. Tàs d $\rho \chi \alpha \dot{s} \kappa \alpha{ }^{2}$ тas dEovoías] Of these words conjoined examples are cited by Wets., to which may be added Onosand. p. 104. The latter denotes magistrates, the former rulers and governors. In this sense $\alpha \rho X^{\eta}$ is almost always found in the plural. I have, however, in Recens. Synop.. adduced examples of the singular from Thucyd. iv. 63. Theogn. 1941. Liban. Orat. p. 369. Potestas in Latin and Podesta in Italian have the sense of $d \xi$. here.










Jac．5．5．
kJob． 20 M．
tera $\mathrm{P}_{2} 6 \mathrm{~S}_{2} 7$ 5m．1．7．1．


 imports participation．The sense is，so＇to divide as to admit me to my share．＇On the thing itself see Grot．，Whitby，and Recens．Syn．
14．Tis $\left.\mu e-i \phi^{\prime} ' \dot{\nu} \mu \bar{a} s\right]$ In allusion to Exod．ii． 14．The difference between $\delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \eta \dot{ }$ and $\mu e$－ ptoris，I had myself thought to be this；that the former signifies an arbitrator，or referee in general ；the latter such a referee as has power to adjust conflicting claims，by apportioning to all parties their proper share．Thus in $\mu \in \rho$ ．may be said to be exegetical of $\delta$ o．，as in a kindred

 however，has pronounced an opinion，which， though it somewhat differs from the above，and from that of all other Commentators，may pro－ bably decide the question．He maintains，that by dıc．is meant a judge publicly appointed；and by $\mu$ epiovis，a privately appointed judge，an arbitrator，one authorized to determine conflict－ ing claims，and apportion what is right to all， usually called a òcaitijs，as in a kindred passage
 Thus what Luke calls $\mu \in \rho \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha}$ ，Plato de Legg． p．915．first calls aipeтоїs $\delta к к а \sigma т \alpha$ s，and then ótaırntás．
15．aúrois］i．e．＇the bystanders，his hearers in general．＇
－$\dot{\delta} \bar{\alpha} \tau \epsilon$ кal $\phi \nu \lambda$.$] ＇Mind and carefully$ guard against．＇So Heliod．cited by Wets．©̈pa $\delta \dot{d}$ oùv，фu入גंтtov．The construction $\phi \cup \lambda$ ．$\dot{\boldsymbol{j}} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{d}$ often occurs in the LXX．，and sometimes in the Classical writers，and answers to our beware of． M $\lambda$ cove $\xi i a$ here denotes an excessive desire of increasing one＇s substance；and it is the scope of the subsequent parable to show how little such a spirit avails，whether to produce happiness，or procure longevity．With this admonition the Commentators compare many moral lessons of the Heathen Philosophers，to which I have in Recens．Synop．added others，the most apposite of which is an answer of the Pythian oracle，pre－ serven by Liban．Orat：фu入áттeo日ai тウ̀̀ фi入o－
 emend the manifest corruption by reading $\tau \boldsymbol{d}$ $\phi \stackrel{\lambda}{ }$ and ex $x$ ov．
 and still more the construction，of this passage， Commentators are not agreed．Kuin．maintains that $\bar{\epsilon} \nu \tau \bar{\varphi} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \epsilon \dot{u} \epsilon \nu \tau \iota \nu t$ signifies＇when there is abundance to any one，＇＇when he has abun－ dance．＇The ouv，he says，is to be referred to
 aüroü．As to the sense，Schleus．，Kuin．，Waht， and Bornem．rightly take it for＇the comfort of life，happiness，＇as in Acts ii．28．Rom．viii． 6. and 1 Pet．iii．10．Thus the sense is，＇In what－ ever affluence a man may be，his happiness de－ pends not on his possessions．Bornem．，however， takes well founded exception to the above con－ struction，and gives the following literal version， ＂non in abundantia cuiquam felicitas versatur ［parta］ex opibus ejus：i．e．nemini propterea quod abunde habet felicitas paratur er opibus quas possidet．＂And he adduces an example of ex in this sense from Xenoph．Conv．iv． 57.
 Synop．，shown that $\chi$ © $\rho a$ here denotes farm；a signification found in the LXX．，Joseph．，and the Classical writers．Eù申ó $\eta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ＇bore well，＇yielded abundant produce．The word is rare，but it occurs in Joseph．Bell．i． 2， 43.
18．$\gamma \in \nu \nu \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau a]$ Literally，＇all the products ［of my lands］：a sense occurring also infra xxii．18．and in the later Greek writers，and the LXX．Tád ${ }^{2} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \theta \dot{a}$ may mean goods generally， as just after；or such produce as might not fall under the name of $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \dot{\mu} \alpha \tau \alpha$ ，as wool， \＆c．
19．$\tau \bar{n} \bar{\eta} \psi \bar{x} \bar{n}$ Mov］Euthym．，Brug．，and Kuin．seem right in taking this to mean＇to myself，＇as in Matt．x．39．And they adduce examples．

19．eidpaivou］This denotes，in a general way，the sensual delight resulting from the ani－ mal gralifications just mentioned，not the least of which is in the East，and in all hot countries，the dyazáverөat，the＇far niente＇of the Italians．
 rivov．

20．eine］Not in words addressed to the man， but by a silent decree．See Prov，i． 26.






















- גंสatroūgt] The Commentators are not agreed as to the Nominat. here. Most think it alludes to those angels, who, as the Jews thought, accompanied the angel of death to require the debt of life, which is inherent in $\alpha \pi a \iota \tau \in i v$. But it seems better to suppose, with the best modern Commentators, that by an idiom common to both Hebrew and Greek, the noun is suppressed, and to be supplied from the context; or $\alpha$ жatrovéat may be regarded as in impersonal form, "it shall be required;' of which idiom there are many examples. See Win. Gr.

21. ofices] i. e. such is the case with, such the folly of. 'Eavtē, ' for himself (only).' On
 are not agreed. Some think the meaning is, ' to be rich for the honour and glory of God,' which is the benefit of man. Others, " to use one's riches agreeably to the will of God." But I prefer that of the antient and many modern Commentators, (as Grot., Beza, Elsn., Wolf, Rosenm. and Kuin.), who take x $\theta_{\text {noavpitecy }}$ rapa $\theta_{\text {ew }}$, 'to lay up riches with God,' namely, by works of charity, benevolence, and virtue in general. Bornem. renders els $\tau \delta \nu$ 0adv quod ad Deum attinet, i. e. so as to ascribe his property to God.
22. dıa roûto] i.e. as I am treating on this subject.
23. Fतeiov] a greater gift. (Campb.)
24. Tous кopaxas] "The Divine Providence (remark Grot. and Bochart) is especially evidenced in respect to ravens, the corvus corax of the Zoologists] for though, as we learn from Aristotle and Elian, the old ones very soon expel their young from the nests, and Philo
says that they often abandon both nest and young; yet, by a wise Providence, they instinctively heap up in their nests whatever creates worms, whereby their abandoned young are preserved." See Ps. cxlvii. 9. and Job xxxviii. 41.

- 8Tt ] 'that,' or 'how.' Ois, for cal dxelvots. Tapeiov. Campb. wrongly renders this 'cellar.' The word ecarcely differs in sense from $\alpha$ тто日iкм. The difference, if any, seems to be this, that tapeĩov denoted a regularly built barn; and axoo., merely one of those temporary depositaries for grain which, we know, have ever been common in the East. Or if dyada be had in view, тa $\mu$. may denote one of those large storehouses, in which whatever was necessary for domestic use was laid up, and thence dispensed.
 perior are ye to fowls.' Kal, and yet.

29. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ метесорi\coote] The sense (missed by most (Commentators) is, ' Be not exalted in mind, fluctuating with hope and fear of a livelihood.' Mereapíseotat signifies properly to be lifted on high; and, among other things, it is said of vessels tossed aloft at sea; from which the present signification is derived. See more in Recens. Synop. and my Note on Thucyd. ii. 8.
30. " $\theta \mathrm{vm}$ тoü кó $\left.\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{mov}}\right]$ This is a plena locutio for the more frequent $\% \omega \nu$, Heb. $0^{\circ}$, denoting "the [other] nations of the world, (besides the Jewish)."
31. Td $\mu u x \rho d v$ то $\mu \mu \nu \iota o y]$ The Article supplies the place of the Vocative, Hellomisticé; or it may stand for the pronoun possessive. The double diminutive implies affectionsy poor little flock.'
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7 Matt. 84.

32. ci̛ósnaev] " hath thought good, or chosen."
33. $\beta a \lambda$ der tia] This is said, by metonymy, for the money contained in the purse. The word signifies the same as $\theta_{\eta \sigma a v \rho d s}$ in the other membet of the sentence, except that by $\theta_{\eta}$ raupds is meant a greater, and by $\beta a \lambda$. a lesser portion of wealth. (Rosenm.) 'Avékג. is a rare word, but it occurs in the LXX., and occasionally in Diod. Sic. and other later writers.
35. ai doves repute\} . ] ~ T h e r e ~ i s ~ h e r e ~ a n ~ a l l u - ~ sion to what must be done before the long-robed inhabitants of the East can engage in any active employment, civil or military. The custom, however, extended to the West, as is testified by numerous passages of the Classical writens.
36. de0pafrots] 'men (servants).' An idiom common to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, and even modern languages, especially when any word corresponding to master is in the context. 'Avalúget, shall return. A sense derived from a nautical metaphor, and used both in the LXX. and Classical writers. Fápos in the plural is
here, as often, used to denote a feast generally.
37. тєрi久. кal àvaк入.] Many Commentators compare this with what took place at the Roman Saturnalia, and the Cretan Hermea. But, as Kuin. remarks, such was common to all servants, good and bad. Here the subject is the reward assigned to diligent and faithful servants. The image (as he observes) only imports, that as the master will treat such servants with unusual condescension and kindness, so will your heavenly master of his free bounty, reward your diligence and fidelity with rewards as disproportionate.
42. cis ${ }^{3} \rho a$, \&cc.] Jesus does not directly anewer to the question proposed by Peter, but implicitè. For, from the following parable, it is manifest that what is said, though applicable to all, is meant especially for the Apostles, who are compared to house-stewards, who in large families used to dispense the allotted portion of food to the servants. Өepazeias, for тळิy Өapaxevóvтшy, abstract for concrete, as frequently, both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. See my Note on Thucyd. v. 23.
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 there is said to be an ellipse of cara．But as the complete phrase has never been produced，though the elliptical one is common，this may be reckon－ ed among those false ellipses which have been swept away，too unmercifully perhaps，by Her－ mann，Schmeer，and others．

To inflict any stripes upon a man for not per－ forming his Lord＇s will，when he had no know－ ledge of it，would be manifestly unjust．Hence some would restrict the words to the knowing the Lord＇s will by a revelation，and the not know－ ing it by that means．But it is better to under－ stand them comparatively，of one who knew it more perfectly，as contrasted with one who knew it less perfectly．And this view has the advan－ rage of including the other．
－may ri］This is not，as some imagine，a Dative absolute，but is put for xduros，being accommodated，by attraction，to ø．．At тape日ćvто sub．ai $\nu$ рштоь．
49．$\pi \bar{u} \rho \bar{j} \lambda \theta_{0 \nu} \beta a \lambda$ ．］Grot．observes，that ＂from the necessity of Christian vigilance，our Lord is led to consider those times of persecu－ tion，when it would be especially needed，and the fire of which would be kindled soon after his death and passion；which are represented under the figure of baptism．＂Others（as Kuin．）con－ sider fire（being opposed to peace and concord） as a general image of discord and dissention， which is then described by its parts．
－Ti 0 en $\lambda \omega-\alpha \nu \dot{\eta} \dot{\varphi} \phi \theta \eta$ ］This clause partakes of that obscurity which is generally inherent in what is uttered amidst extreme mental agitation： And hence Commentators are at issue on its meaning．Grot．，Whitby，and others，assign to
the $\boldsymbol{c l}$ the sense＇$O$ that，＇and render，＇And what do I wish ？O that it were already kindled！＇But though $e l$ be sometimes used for ci Oc，as in Luke xix．42．\＆xxii．42．，it is in a very different con－ struction．Rosenm．and Kain．take the $\tau i$ for $\pi \bar{\omega} s$ ，and the el for ut，like the Heb．OK，render－ ing，＇And how much I wish that it were already accomplished！＇But both significations，in such a context as the present，are precarious．I prefer， with Le Clerc and Camps．，the rendering of the Vulgate，＇Quid vole，nisi ut accendatur．＇But to take el for $\epsilon l \mu \dot{\eta}$ is unauthorized．It is better to retain the usual signification of $e l$ ，and take $\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega$ for $\theta \epsilon \lambda$ oıць，with the Syr．Version，q．d． ＇And what should I（have to）wish，if it were but already kindled？＇the very sense expressed by the Vulg．，but thus elicited without any rio－ lance．Perhaps，however，we may，with Wines and Bornem．，take el for del，since．（Lite－ rally if，as is the case．）Ti will be for did $\tau \boldsymbol{\tau}$ ， why．
 must be plunged into dire calamities．See Note on Matt．xx． 22.
－cal meos－re入єo日句］＇And how am I dis－ tressed till it be accomplished！＇इuvéxeotas signifies properly＇to be hemmed in，＇and is used with a Dative，denoting disease，or calamity， either expressed，or implied．The term here merely denotes an anxious longing．

51．$\left.\alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \hat{\eta}\right]$ ，The Commentators explain this by＇imo potius．＇But of that sense no proof has been adduced．Perhaps there will be no occasion to deviate from the usual sense of $\eta$ ，if $\alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ be taken，not for $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha^{2}$ ，but $\alpha \lambda \lambda o$ ，and an ellipse be supposed of ours，to be taken from oui，and which was occasioned by the interposition of $\lambda$ é $\gamma \oplus$ is $\mu i ̄ y$ ．There is only a choice of difficult

64．Tiv veфe入ฑv］i．e．＇the cloud；＇alva；




(Ppor. 85 Anor 28














to a well known phænomenon, explained by the writers on Jewish Antiquities. See Middlet.
56. Tdv кaspdv roürov] i.e. the time when, according to the prophets, the Messiah is to appear.
57. סiккcov] 'what is reasonable,' as in Phil. i. 7. and elsewhere.
58. $\delta \delta s$ d $\rho \gamma a \sigma i a \nu]$ A Latinism for ' da operam.'
 of any thing;' or "to be dismissed or let go by any person." "It is used (says Schleusn.) in a forensic sense, of a criminal who is dismissed, when an adversary does not follow up an accusation, or of a debtor who receives an acquittance from his creditor by paying the money due, or making a composition.'

- тра́кторє] Пра́ттеь and сloлра́ттеьу signify 'to exact the payment of a mulct, or its equivalent in corporal punishment;' and w $\alpha^{\prime} \kappa r \infty \rho$ denotes the eractor pana, (as in Teachyl. Eum. iii. 13. трdктореs alıatos), and in a general sense, the executioner of a magistrate's sentence.
XIII. 1. Tapท̄бav] 'came up,' as in Matt. xxvi. 50. This signification is often found in the best Classical writers, though in the earlier and purer ones followed by els and a proper name. In the later ones the word is, as here, used absolutely. So Diod. Sic xvii. 8. тарทิбáv тьyes dxayүe入入ontes, \&c.
- тepl т $\bar{\omega} \nu \Gamma a \lambda$. stance in the history of that time this incident is to be referred, it is impossible to say. Those which the Commentators mention (as the sedition of the Samaritans on Mount Gerizim, or the rebellion set on foot by the followers of Judas of Galilee) are liable to insuperable objections. The affair was probably one (like the murder of the babes at Bethlehem) not recorded by Joaephus. Though nothing is more probable than that something of this sort should have happened; for the Gali-
læans were the most seditious people in Judaa. Josephus has not, indeed, mentioned any Galilaans slain in the Temple by Pilate; but we learn from various parts of his history (see Ant. xv. 4. \& 7. xvii. 9, 3. \& vi. 17, 10.) that tumults often arose at the festivals, and sometimes battles took place even in the Temple. Thus Josephus relates that Archelaus put to death 300 Galilaans in the Temple in the act of sedition. It is therefore likely that a similar insurrection of Galilæans at the same period (a festival) happened in the government of Pilate, and was repressed in the same manner.

With respect to the phraseology, there is in $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \theta u \sigma \iota \bar{\omega} \nu$ an ellipse of alцatos, to be supplied from al $\mu \alpha$; an idiom found both in the Greek and Latin writers. The complete expression occurs in a passage of Philo. ii. 3151. cited by Wets. It is a boldly figurative way of saying, that they were slain while attending the sacrifice, as in a kindred passage of Theophyl. Simoc., which I have adduced in Recens. Syn. How atrocious it was thought to slay any one at an altar, is well known. The circumstance in question was, it seems, mentioned as being the effect of a Divine judgment on the sufferers. And our Lord's answer is meant to remove the erroneous notion of considering that, or such like calamities, as marks of Divine vengeance; and moreover to predict a similar fate to those who would not repent; a prediction which ere long attained its full completion, when, in the very Temple, innumerable multitudes of Jews were slain, and their blood was literally mingled with the blood of the victims.
2. тapa] 'beyond,' as Luke iii. 13. and elsewhere. So the Latin prater.
4. iv $\tau \varphi_{\varphi} \Sigma_{l} \lambda$.] The sense is, 'at,' i.e. by, 'Siloam;' for this tower is said to have been one of the towers of the city walls. 'Oфeilérat, sinners. A Chaldee idiom, by which debts























and sins，and debtors and sinners，are inter－ changed．
7．Tpia dTv］At which time，from the period of fruit bearing the Naturalists tell us，those that bear at all will produce fruit．Kaтapүєi，i．e． dpydv molet，＇makes it unproductive．＇The only other passage in which this sense is found is in Ezra iv．21．Though the term is often figu－ ratively applied to denote abrogating a law．
9．ко́xpıa］This，instead of кот piav，is found in a great number of MSS．and early Edd．，and is adopted by Wets．，Matth．，Griesb．，Vat．， Tittm．，and Scholz．
 tgec．On this idiom I have before treated．See also my Note on Thucyd．iii． 3.
 weakness．＇The recent Commentators mostly regard $\pi \nu . \dot{a} \sigma \theta$ ．as a periphrasis for dofeveiav， as denoting simply a disease．But the passages of the Classical writers which they adduce are of a different nature．The words of our Lord at
 very significant ；and，considering the very fre－ quent use of $\pi \nu \in \bar{u} \mu a$ in the sense $\delta a \iota \mu o ́ v i o v$, it cannot be doubted but that the sense is（as the antient and most modern Commentators main－ tain ）＇having a dæmon which inflicts disease or
 where see Note．It was，indeed，the Jewish opinion，that diseases，especially the severely acute and tediously chronic ones，were inflicted by demens；and this is no more than what was
the belief of many of the greatest Greek Philo－ sophers．See Recens．Synop．But the pecu－ liarity of the present expression，and the words of our Lord himself must constrain us to suppose a real dæmoniacal possession．Euthym．well


11．кal $\dot{\eta} \nu \sigma v \kappa$ ．］＇she was bowed together．＇ This is not simply an active in a passive sense ；for I suspect that the word was sometimes used in a neuter sense for $\sigma \dot{\prime} \gamma \kappa \cup \boldsymbol{\phi}$ os eTvat；from which the transition to a passive one is easy．The disorder
 spine，and extends to the loins，inducing a total inactivity of the vertebre，so that the patient is necessarily bowed together，from utter weakness of the parts．And therefore the disease might very well be called кa $\tau^{\prime}$ d $\xi_{o} \chi^{\eta \nu \nu}$（as it seems to have been）dंनी́veca．The words els $\tau \delta$ may－ тєג＇s are a phrase for the adverb mavte入cis，as Hebr．vii．25．and sometimes in the later Classical writers．

12．dто入e入uval］Both the Hebrew and Greek writers were accustomed to compare disorders to chains and ropes，by which men are，as it were， held bound．Of this Kypke and Wets．produce several examples．

13．$\alpha v \omega \rho \theta \dot{\omega} \dot{\theta} \eta$ ］＇she was made straight．＇
15．ou $\lambda \dot{u}$ é，\＆cc．］That it was made allowable to attend to the necessary care（even laborious as it might be）even of animals on the Sabbath，is clear from many passages of the Rabbinical writers cited by Schoetg．Nay even Pagan superstition
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permitted various employments of husbandry even on the solemn festivals.
23. ©l $\dot{\text { i } i \text { ío oi }} \sigma \omega \zeta$.] Some of the most eminent Commentators from Hamm. to Kuin. have been of opinion that $\sigma$ cu'̧ecөar here signifies to be put in the way of salcation. But that interpretation, however ably supported, appears magis arguta quàm vera. That of the antient and earlier modern ones, who understand it of eternal saluation, is far more natural, and correspondent to the words of our Lord's reply. Whether the question was a captious one, or not (though the latter is the more probable opinion), certain it is (as appears from Lightf. and Schoetg.) that the present was a disputed one in the Jewish schools; some maintaining universal salvation, others limiting it to a few elect. Now to a question of such minor importance as this (for it rather concerns us, as Grot. observes, to know what sort of persons will be saved, than how few) our Lord (agreeably to his custom of never answering questions of mere curiosity) was pleased to return no answer; but makes his words an answer to the question which ought rather to have been asked, namely, "how salyation is to be attained." 'A 'rovi'̧eotat is a very significant term, founded
on an agonistic allusion. The sense is, 'strain every nerve. This use of $\epsilon i$ for жóтероv, in direct address is rare; in indirect address it is not unfrequent either in the Scriptural or Classical writers. The best mode of viewing the former idiom is to consider it as a blending of the oratio directa with the indirecta.
25. $\alpha \phi$ ' ovi] , Sub. xpóvov, 'from the time,' ' when once. ' $\mathbf{E} \gamma \in \rho \theta \hat{\eta}$ is not (as some imagine) redundant, but is a part of the imagery of the, story, and signifies, 'has risen from his seat.'
 used by the best Greek writers. And so pulsare ades in Plautus. There is probably an ellipse of èzl, which is supplied in Judg. xix. 22 .
26. ${ }^{\text {,bućm }}$ Lóv oou] ' in thy presence and company.' This mode of address is a popular form of rousing any one's recollection of a person, as denoting familiar intercourse.
 the $\epsilon_{\rho \gamma}$. as denoting habit and devotedness to. Schleus. compares Xen. Mem. ii. 1, 27. ка入ây каi $\sigma \in \mu \nu \omega \bar{\nu}$ ep $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta s$. To which 1 would add
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32．Tî ¿入о́жтєк т．］Our Lond did not（as Wets．observes）use this expressiou by way of contumely，but to show his intimate knowledge of his disposition and secret policy．
 reasoning in this verse is，＇I am employed inno－ cently，and even highly meritoriously，nor shall I long weary him with my presence，but soon take my departure；why then should he seek my life？＇ rípepoy kal aúptov is admitted to be a $^{\text {a }}$ proverbial form denoting any short interval of time，as in a kindred passage of Arrian Epict． iv．10．and Hos．vi．2．cited by Wets．But on relecoüpac the Commentators are not agreed． Some recent ones take it to mean，＇I shall be sacrificed；＇but they adduce no valid proof． It is better，with the antient and most modern Interpreters，to consider it as an Attic contract，
 －I shall be brought to my end，shall have finished my course，shall die．＇So Phil．iii．12．oùx ört मैंग $\eta$ тетe入eitomac．Yet this method is liable to some objection，and Bornem．，with reason， objects that the penult of this verb is long， and adverts to similar errors in the forms of other verbs in the Classics．Here certainly the Present form may be tolerated，nay is required by the correspondent verbs foregoing，$i^{\alpha} \kappa \beta \alpha \lambda \lambda_{\omega}$ and $\delta \pi เ \tau \in \lambda \bar{\omega}$ ，though the sense be＂I am to be brought to my end，＂which involves a sense of what is not only future，but very shortly to take place．

33．Tiriv－mopuúco日at］The sense seems（as Kuin．suggests）to be，＂However， 1 must for this short time go on in my ueual course or
ministry．＇Mopev̄єrөat，（like the Hebr．חh）as it denotes habitual action，so it sometimes sig－ nifies simply the performance of habitual or regular business．
 contain one of the most cutting reproaches ima－ ginable．Of course，oúc èjóéXerat must be understood with the due limitation of such sort of acutè dicta，i．e．＂it can scarcely be．＂
XIV．1．фа mentators say，is formed from the Heb．on לn $2 x$ ， which though it properly signifies no more than ＇to take food，＇yet often denotes to feast，to make good cheer．But that sense， 1 apprehend，is never found except when the meal is one to which company are invited；and then it will be supposed that the cheer is better than that of an ordinary domestic meal．But then this is never the signification of the phrase，and is only implied in the context．Such a meal，no doubt，was the present．And indeed it appears from what Lightf．，Wets．，and others have copiously ad－ duced from the Rabbinical writers，that it was usual with the Jews（as we might suppose）to have better provisions on the Sabbath than on other days．But it further appears that the Jews used to make feasts and give entertainments especially on that day．Amidst all this，how－ ever，it appears that the phrase фayeiv ajprov formed one of those usages of primitive simpli－ city of diction which yet retained its place．

By tıvos tềy dipX．tūy \＄ap．is meant（as Grot．，Hamm．，Whitby，Pearce，and Campb． have shown）one of the rulers（i．e．of a syna－ gogue）who was a Pharisee．Comp．Joh．iii． 1.
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That all such rulers were not Pharisees，appears from Joh．vii． 48.
 having probably so placed himself，though he did not dare to ask for cure，it being the Sabbath day．

5．dтокр $1 \theta \in i s]$＇addressing them．
－Tivos］Bornem．rightly renders ecquis，\＆xc．
－\％$\nu 0$ s］Many valuable MSS．，Versions，and some Fathers，and early Edd．have vios，which is adopted by Wets．，Matth．，and Scholz；but without sufficient reason；for the canon of pre－ ferring the more difficult reading does not apply in cases where that would involve an exceeding harshness，and violate the usage of the language， or where the words are very similar．Such is the case here．In these sort of sayings an ass and a horse are put for any kind of animal，as being in the most common use．See more in Camp－ bell．

7．xapaßodriv］The word here denotes simply a precept．See Grot．＇Exéxco．Some imagine here an ellipse of $\tau 0 \dot{s} \dot{s} \delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o u ́ s$. But as they adduce examples only of the complete phrase $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \dot{x} \chi \in \iota \nu \dot{\delta} \phi \theta$ ．Tıvı，not of the elliptical one，this cannot be admitted．Others，more properly， supply $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\boldsymbol{o}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ voūv，both here and at Acts iii． 5. But even that is so seldom found supplied，that it is better to suppose no ellipse at all，as in

1 Tim．iv．16．ётeXe $\sigma$ eavtழ．Thus it will simply signify＇observing：＇
9．ठos rónov］＇give place，seat，situation．＇ The phrase often occurs in the later Greek Clas－ sical writers．It was probably founded on the Latin locum dare．From Schoetg．it appears that this was the phrase used on such occasions by the Jews，who，as well as the Greeks and Romans had frequent disputes about the chief seats at feasts．

11．$\left.\pi a ̂ q-\dot{i} \psi \infty \theta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \in \tau a t\right]$ Similar sentiments occur in the Rabbinical writers．
12．$\mu$ ท̀ фwivec toùs $\phi$ inous \＆cc．］The best Commentators are of opinion that the negative particle must here be taken with limitation，and rendered non tam，quam，as in many passages of the O．and N．T．This idiom，however，is pro－ perly confined to cases where the two particles are employed in the same sentence，not，as here， in two different ones，and Winer and Bornem． rightly reject it here．Thus it appears that，after every limitation，the duty of charity is considered as far more obligatory than that of hospitality．

This sense of qweveì is very rare，and is founded on that more frequent one by which the word denotes to hail any one，and，from the ad－ junct，to summon or call him to us．

14．̈̈ть о⿱亠䒑к－dעт．$\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho, \& c$ ．］The sense is， －because，though they can make thee no return， a return will be made thee，＇\＆c．
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 Youns in Joh. v. 29 . where it is opposed to avact. coifecos. The Pharisees believed in a resurrection of the just, but imagined that there would be two resurrections, the first to take place at the coming of the Messiah, who would establish an earthly kingdom, to which the Pharisee here evidently alludes.
18. $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{r} \dot{\delta} \mu \bar{\alpha} \bar{s}]$ There is here manifestly an ellipse, in filling up which Philologists differ. Some understand iopas; others $\gamma \nu \omega^{\prime} \mu \eta s$; others, again, фwиฑ̈s, which is expressed in Joseph. ii. 509. and Diod. Sic. 515. D. But the true ellipse seems to be $\gamma \nu \dot{j} \mu \eta$ s, on which see Bos. MapatreioӨat here signifies to excuse oneself, as in Joseph. Ant. viii. 8, 2., as is clear from the following éxe $\mu$ e тарŋттии́vov, which is a Latinism formed on the ercusatum me habeas rogo, which occurs in Martial.

- áरpov ท่ $\gamma o ́ \rho a \sigma a$ ] As we cannot suppose that a man would buy land without seeing it, or that having bought it, the going to see it should be a matter of such urgency, most recent Commentators take the sense to be emere volo, I intend to buy. But this is too precarious a view to be admitted. Others suppose that the purchase was conditional. But of such a mode of purchasing land, i.e. on warrant, there is no proof, and the interpretation is allogether hypothetical. The best method of interpretation seems to be that proposed in Recens. Synop., namely, to take the Aorist in the sense of a present tense (on which idiom see Matth. Gr. Gr. $\$ 506$. and $W$ in. Gr. Gr. 6 34. Note 3.) Thus the sense will be, : I have been purchasing,' i.e. 'been in treaty for;' whirh well accounts for the gring and
secing, corresponding to the going and proving the oxen just after mentioned. Bornem. rightly observes that $\ddagger \rho \omega \tau{ }^{-} \sigma \in$ just after is extra structuram, as aitoūpai oe in Eurip. Alc. 318. \& 1047.
 render मi yópara, 'I am in treaty for,' because though in a passage of a Rabbinical writer mention is made of some oxen sold on warranty, and subject to subsequent proof, yet we may readily imagine that such cases were rare. It seems, however, from Theognis Sentent. 126. to have been a custom with the antients to try oxen, as we do horses; for he says: Oú $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\mu} \dot{\alpha} \hat{\alpha} \nu$ eideins
 ஸ̈नTeค и́x Oそuyíou.

20. yuvaíca oú dúvarat t $\lambda \theta \epsilon i v]$ This was the most specious excuse; for by the laws and customs of most nations, any omission in the duties, much less the etiquette, of life was thought venial in newly married persons; hence even soldiers had usually a furlough for a year.
21. $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\eta} \gamma \gamma \in \iota \in-\tau а u ̈ \tau \alpha]$ 'reported these excusatory messages.' 'Púpas, ' lanes;' a signification only found in the later writers, and, as appears from Lobeck on Phryn., first employed as a comic appellation. Toùs $\boldsymbol{x} \tau \infty \times$ ous-Tuphoùs, i.e. the most wretched and miserable objects. We are not, however, to understand that others were not pressed to come.
22. фрaymous] The Commentators all take this to mean ' places fenced off.' But that sense is quite unsatisfactory. From the connexion of this with joious, it is plain that some kind of road is meant; and as $\phi$ parmos signifies phat we call in the country a dead jence, (i.e. with
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faggots) so the sense here must be, 'a fenced path,' such as when carried across vineyards, orchards, \&cc. would require to be fenced off, to secure the produce. Thus odous and $\phi \rho a \gamma \mu o$ ovs $^{2}$ may be rendered 'the high roads and bye-paths,' corresponding to the streets and lanes before.
 have been long agreed, that this can only denote the moral compunction of earnest persuasion. See Note on Matt. xiv. 22.
26. $\mu \iota \sigma \in \bar{\imath}$ ] i.e. comparatively, namely ' minus amat, as appears from Matt. vi. 24. \& x. 37. Tive e. фuxpy, 'his own life.'
28. xúpyov] Doddr. supposes this to be such a tower as was built in the vineyards of the Fast, for the temporary accommodation of those who guarded the produce. But the costliness implied in calculating its expense plainly indicates (as the best Commentators have seen) a permanent mansion of the highest class, such as was called rúpyos, by a similar figure as that in the Latin turris, as denoling a turreted house, and, by implication, a considerable edifice.
 and some without the $\tau \dot{\alpha}$, which is cancelled by Griesb. and Scholz; rightly, if the construction be what Bornem, affirms, el EXec Tiv dawávทv cis $d \pi$.

- кa0ifas] This is used graphicè, and is merely ad ornatum. $\psi \eta \phi$ ǐsecv signifies, 1. to count by dropping pebbles; ( $\psi$ rí申ous) a primitive mode of calculation still preserved in barbarous nations; 2. to calculate, reckon, compute.

31. $\sigma v \mu \beta a \lambda e i v]$ The construction $\sigma v \mu \beta a^{2} \lambda$ -
 the Classical writers. Such adjuncts are eregetical. Ka0lacas is, as before, said graphicè, and cati\}ety and the Latin sedere are often joined in expressions denoting to take counsel.
 is meant what tends to peace, i.e. proposals for peace, conditions of peace. So $\tau \bar{a} \bar{\lambda} \mathrm{~s}$ elpriyns in Rom. xiv. 19. Wets. appositely cites a similar

32. $\alpha$ жот $\alpha \sigma \sigma e \sigma \theta a t$ ] ' to renounce, forsake.' 'Axorá天бetv signifies, 1. to range into parts. 2. (in the middle voice) to take part with one, which implies 3dly to renounce the other. This last sense of the word is Alexandrian Greek, and only found in Joseph. and other later writers.
XV. 2. סcerofyuYov] The doa here signifies
 admission to any one's company or acquaintances, and quycooliecv, to his intimacy. See 1 Cor, v.11. Gal.ii. 12. and Ps. ci. 5.
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33. $d \pi i$ joined with verbs of motion indicates the purpose of the action. Kypke aptly compares biog. Laert. i. 10, 2. $\pi \in \mu \phi \theta \epsilon i s-\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ $\pi \rho o ́ \beta a \tau o \nu$. To which may be added Thucyd. iv. 13. © $\pi i$

34. ex $\left.\pi เ \tau i \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu-\omega^{\prime} \mu o u s\right]$ It may have been, as some say, a custom with the Jewish shepherds to carry their sheep on their shoulders. But this passage will not prove it ; for a lost sheep far from home must by shepherds of all countries be conveyed in some such manner, since one sheep cannot be driven.
35. $\dot{\eta}$ ] for $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda \frac{1}{\eta}$, as in the best writers, e. gr. Thucyd. ii. 11. See Winter. Gr. $\$ 28$. who accounts for the idiom from Hebraism. But Bornem. more rightly refers it to the construction being moulded as if rórepon el had preceded: citing Ecclus. 22.15.
36. Tis yuri] With this parable the Commentaters compare a very similar one from the Kabbinical writings.
 need; since (as we find from the remains of Herculaneum and Pompeii) the houses of the lower orders in antient times either had no windows, or what were rather like the loop-holes in our barns.
37. cire $\delta \dot{\delta}]$ ' he moreover said.'
38. Td $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \beta a \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \mu e ́ \rho o s] . ~ S u b . ~ \mu o z ~ f r o m ~ t h e ~, ~$ preceding, 'the portion which falleth to me.'
 writers from Herodot. downwards. See examples in Recens. Synop, and my Note on Thucyd.
i.99. The Jewish law did not, any more than the Roman, permit to a father the arbitrary disposal of his whole property. It was entailed on the children in equal portions, except that the first-born had a double share. Such distribuion, however, was sometimes made by an indulgent parent to his children during his life time, with a reservation of what was necessary to the support of himself and the rest of the family, if any. It would indeed appear from passages of Theophrastus and Dionys. Hal. which I have adduced in Recens. Synop., that this was not unfrequently the case.

- $\tau \delta \nu$ (i iv] ' his substance,' or property, denoting almost always moveable property.

13. ouvaүay civ 'drava] The sense is, 'having converted the whole into money;' as is clear from two passages cited by Wets. from Plutarch, p. 772. and Quintill. Dial. v. So we say to convert goods into money. There is, however, no ellipsis of els deyúptov, but only that circumstance is implied in var., which seems to have been a form of expression used in common life.

- סєєбко́ртєге]. 'dissipated.' A metaphor taken from winnowing. So Alexis cited by Wets. -mai ̄pav dंगédecke tiv oúaiav.
 originally denoted one who cannot be saved; but was afterwards used, in an active sense, to denote ' one who cannot save,' a prodigal, a dissolute person. Some Commentators, however, maintain a passive sense, referring to Aristot. Eth. iv. 1. But that passage supplies no cert



















it is plain that Aristotle considered the word as having an active sense, since he just after explains it by aкратс̄s кal cls dко入aбíav סaтavทpoús; the most accurate definition that has ever yet been given of the word.

14. lo $X \cup \rho d s$ ] 'severe, extreme.' An epithet not unfrequent with nouns signifying famine or pestilence. Kava, over, throughout.
15. ̇єко $\lambda \lambda_{r} \theta_{\eta}$ ] ' connected himself with,' i.e. bound or engaged himself to. The verb has properly a passive sense, but is always used in a reflected or reciprocal one. Bóбкeн yoípous. An employment considered by all the antient nations, even where no religious prejudices subsisted, as among the vilest and most contemptible. How degrading, then, for a Jow to be thus occupied!
 which many Translators and Commentators assign to these words is very unsatisfactory. Camp. strenuously maintains, that dжe cannot denote desire ungratified (for the young man (rays he) had surely the power, and would scarcely scruple to satisfy his hunger on the huske; and that it is in vain to support this view by taking for granted circumstances which do not appear from the story. This is very true, but little to the purpose. It will only hold good against supplying кєратím at édídov aùтẹ. It may be argued, why should oúdels have been used? for surely none could give him even of the керátıa but his master. One mode of avoiding the difficulty connected with the common version ' he desired to fill his belly,' is, with Campb. and others, to take غ́xı $\theta \nu \mu \in \mathfrak{i} \nu$ for $\alpha \gamma a \pi \bar{a} \nu$, 'to be fain,' i.e. content ; and to suppose at oudels
 as I have shown infra xvi.21., that sense has not been established on any certain authority, and it
is liable to some objections on the score of the sense yielded. I would now acquiesce in the common version 'he would fain have filled his belly,' \&c. 'And yet no one gave him any food,' i.e. such as is eaten by men. (See more on xvi.21.) His wages, in a season of extreme scarcity and dearness, were not likely to supply him with food sufficient. By the кeparion Commentators are now agreed is meant (as Sir Tho. Brown first proved) the fruit of the ceratonia siliquasa or carob tree, common in the Southern and Eastern countries, and still used for feeding swine, nay occasionally eaten by the poorer sort of people, as were the silique among the Romans.
16. els cautdv $\langle\lambda \theta \omega \dot{ }$ ] The phrase is properly used of revival from a fainting fit, or recovery from insanity, or awakening from a torpid sleep; but is occasionally employed in a metaphorical sense (as here) of recovery from the delusion of vice, of which examples are adduced by Wets., Kypke, and others.
17. oupavdv] for $\tau \delta \nu \Theta \epsilon \delta \nu$, an Orientalism. 'Avaotas for cioćcos.
18. кal This is omitted in a considerable number of the best MSS. and Versions, and is cancelled by almost all Editors.
 showing forgiveness and reconciliation.
19. тárep \&cc.] He commences the confession he had meditated, notwithstanding he had the embrace of forgiveness, yet does not finish his intended speech; being, we may suppose, interrupted in uttering the last words molnoovoov by the words of his father.
20. éevéyкатe \&c.] The articles called for are such whose use denoted freedom and dignity; and the robe is to be the best. This use of трюิтos is rarely found out of the Scriptures.

















 $\lambda \omega \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \dot{\eta} \nu, \kappa a l \operatorname{\epsilon ij} \hat{\rho}^{\prime} \theta \eta$.
1 XVI. "Ene「E סè cai mpòs toùs maӨךтàs aútoû. "Av-




21. $\tau \delta \nu \mu o ́ \sigma \chi o \nu \tau \delta \nu \sigma \iota \tau$.] i.e. one such as we may suppose most opulent rustic families would be usually provided with for any extraordinary call for hospitality, as with us poultry. And real was by the antients reckoned a delicacy. On $\theta$ úgare, butcher, see Note on Matt. xxii. 4.
 taken, as the ancient and most modern Interpeters explain, in a metaphorical sense of spiritual death and coming to life again by repentance ; a sense often occurring in Scripture, and not unfrequent in the Classical writers.
 very ancient, and Oriental custom to have concerts of music at entertainments. See Homs. Od. xvii. 358.
22. ن'riaivovia] 'safe and sound.' So the Greeks say awe al ivıท̂, as Herodo. iii. 124. Thucyd. iii. 34.
23. dou 入cún] The present tense here denotes continuity, ' I have been and am serving thee.'
 denote prodigality is common in all the Classical writers from Homer downwards. See many examples in Recens. Synop.
 thine as my heir (for his brother had forfeited all title to inheritance). Such a person the Romans called Hers minor.
XVI. 1. defporós cis j $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi}$.$) On the ob-$ ject of this Parable the Commentators widely
differ. (See Recens. Synop.) It is, however, generally admitted to have an affinity to the foregoing one, and, like that, to have been meant for the instruction of Christ's followers in general; for $\mu \alpha \theta_{\eta \tau a l}$ is often taken in this extended sense. And as that represents the consequences of living without God in the world; so this seems to have been meant to teach men the true use of riches, and how they may be employed, so that being in this world rich towards God, they may attain eternal happiness in the world to come. A parable very similar to this is cited from D. Kimchi on Isaiah xl. 21.

- olкoyónov] The olkoyó nos was a domestic, generally a free man, who discharged duties corresponding with those of our house stewards and of our house-keepers. $\Delta \iota \beta \beta \lambda^{\prime} \theta_{\eta}$, was accused. This use of the word, of a true and not of a calumnious charge, is chiefly found in the Sept. and the later Greek writers.

2. $T i]$ for staci, how! importing expostulation and anger. But there may be, as Bornem. maintains an ellipse of $\delta$, and thus $\tau l$ will denote what. To v $\lambda$ of ${ }^{\circ}$ or, ' the account,' viz. which youare bound to give. So Plato Phased. §8. imit do тoîs sincaotaîs $\beta$ oúגo pat adv $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v ~ d x o d o u ̃ v a t, ~$ 'give my account.' $\Delta u y{ }^{\prime} \sigma^{\prime}$ is not redundant, but signifies must, i. e. unless thou give a satisfactory account. The not attending to this point has occasioned many misconceptions in the interpretation of the Parable.










 ${ }_{6}{ }^{2}$

- Matt. 6. 19. et 19.81. 1 Tim. 6. 19.




3. $\alpha \phi$ ¢орeitrat] ' is taking,' has taken away.
 have not strength to work as a day labourer;' of which occupation digging, as being the most laborious and servile (hence prisoners of war were often set to it) is put for the whole. The expression seems to have been proverbial. So, among the passages which I have adduced in Recens. Synop., Phocyl. el dé tıs où dédaкe

 єтібтацає.
4. '̈ $\gamma \nu \omega 0 \nu$ ] ' I have resolved.' A use of $\gamma^{\prime \prime} \gamma_{\nu \omega \prime \sigma \kappa \omega}$ frequent in the best writers. Or, as Kuin. and others explain, 'I understand' or discern, a thought has occurred to me. Metaoтa日ले. Me from office. In $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \omega \nu \tau a t$ we have antecedent for consequent (support), as in Joh. xix. 27. tég. may (as Kuin. directs) be taken impersonally; but, on account of the aúcciv following, it is better to suppose an ellipse of $\dot{\alpha} \nu 0$ pwotol; or rather there seems to be a reference to certain persons in the mind of the steward, i.e. his master's debtors.
 as examples of what was said to all.
5. dégal тò $\gamma \rho \alpha \alpha_{\mu \mu \alpha ~ \& c c .] ~ T h e r e ~ i s ~ s o m e ~}^{\text {a }}$ doubt as to the sense of $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha$. The almost invariable opinion of Commentators, antient and modern, is that it signifies a bond, or engugement, of which sense Kypke adduces four examples from Josephus and Libanius. And Grot. has proved that $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha$ and the Latin litere had the signification of syngrapha, or chirographa, (so we say a note of hand) and cautio. These bonds, he shows, were kept in the hands of the steward. The thing, however, is not quite clear ; and to make it so, Dr. A. Clarke remarks, that "this rpá $\mu \mu a$ was a writing in which the debt was specified, together with the obligation to pay so much, at such and such times. This appears to have been in the hand writing of the debtor, and probably signed by the steward: and this precluded imposition on each part. To prevent all appearance of forgery in this case, he is desired to write it over again, and cancel the old engagement." That it was in the hand writing
of the debtor, is certain. Yet such a note of hand could not require the steward's signature. I cannot therefore but think that the opinion originally formed of this passage, (see Recens. Synop.) and which was also entertained by Macknight, is the true one. These $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a \tau \alpha$ were, it should seem, both bonds and contracts. Those who took land were, we may suppose, required, previously to occupancy, to execute and sign an engagement binding them to pay as rent a certain portion of the produce to the proprietor. This was, no doubt, countersigned by the proprietor or his steward, with an acceptance thereof, of which a copy was given to the occupier for his security. Thus the writing in question, being both an engagement and a contract, was rightly styled a $\gamma \rho \dot{\mu} \mu \mu \alpha$, in whichever sense that word may be taken. This would be a lasting advantage to the tenants, and, of course, would entitle the steward to a proportionably greater degree of their gratitude.
6. кúptos] ' the master (of the steward),' not, as it is vulgarly interpreted, 'the Lord,' i. e. Christ. 'Eryjvece, ' commended him,' not for his fraud, but, besides his prudence in securing his future subsistence, for the dexterity with which he had effected it ; (as, in Terent. Heuton. iii. 2, 26.,Chremes does a knavish servant; "Syrus. Eho! laudas, queso, qui heros fallerent? Chremes in loco ego vere laudo"'), for a blundering fraud would merit both censure and contempt. \$povímws, astutè. Tdv olk. Tท̄s ádıкías, for тdи oik. тd̀ adiscov, (Hebraicè) the fraudulent steward.
 which occurs at $\nabla .11$.)

- ört oi viol-ciol] The best Commentators are agreed that these are the words, not of the master, but of Christ suggesting an important admonition. By oi viol toû alcôvos are meant those who are devoted to the things of this world, as children to their parents. By ol viol roù $\phi \omega \tau d s$, those who are studious of true religion. Both phrases are found in the Rabbinical writings. The words els тìv yeveà $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ are exegetical of ppovimcs, and admit of various explanations, according as a literal or metaphorical sense be adopted. For the latter there is no authority, and as to the former, it may denote
'as far as regards the age in which they live.' But it more probably signifies 'in respect to (i.e. as regards their dealings with) the men of their generation, their contemporaries, and those with whom they have to do.' This signification of yevea is frequent in the NoT.

9. тoırjare- $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \alpha{ }^{2}$ ] On the whole of this verse there is no little diversity of interpretation.
 plainly for $\mu a \mu \cos \bar{a}$ díiкov, by a common He braism. But the force of the epithet here is not $s 0$ clear. Some take $\mu \alpha \mu \infty \nu \hat{\alpha} \tau \bar{\eta} s$ di. to denote riches acquired by injustice, for which, indeed, there is no want of authority. But this cannot here be admitted, because it would lead to a sense which would inculcate a doctrine unworthy of the Gospel; as if the wrath of God for ill-gotten gain could be appeased by giving to the poor. Far better, therefore, is it to suppose, with the best modern Commentators, that didıcia is here to be taken in the sense deceitful, unstable, as opposed to $\alpha \lambda_{\eta} \theta \iota \nu d s$, as at ver. 11. Of this sense they adduce many examples from the LXX. and the Classical writers, and a few from the N. T. But these last are not to the purpose; and the others doubtful, as taken from poetic phraseology. That our Lord elsewhere calls riches fallacious, is no proof that they are so called here. I should therefore prefer, with some antient and several modern Commentators, to suppose that the epithet has reference, in a general sense, to the means whereby riches are often acquired. And I would suggest that adicia sometimes is used of harsh and griping conduct, and taking unfair advantages, without which riches, it is to be feared, are rarely amassed. See Matth. xxv. 24. Bornem. would remove the difficulty by supplying, from conjecture, an où after $\lambda$ é $\gamma \infty$; adducing several examples, both from the Classics and the Scriptures, of a negative particle being lost. But they are almost invariably taken from authors, of which we have few MSS., or where only a few MSS. present the omission. That the ov should here have been omitted in all the MSS., antient and modern, is so very improbable as to present a difficulty far greater than the difficulty of interpreting the passage as it stands. That difficulty, too, is eraggerated, and indeed unnecessarily increased by Bornem. who chuses to take didcnias for iniquitatis causa, though the sense of olxóyouov Tins dósias is fired by the $\mu$ aumiva тiss ado. just afterwards. At éк入íryre there is an ellipse of $\tau d \nu$ $\beta \iota \delta \nu$, which is generally expressed in the Classical writers, though in the LXX. always omitted.

With respect to dégcrrat, many antient and modern Commentators understand by it the angels appointed to receive departed spirits. And for this there is countenance in Matth. xxiv. 31. Luke vi. 38. \& especially xii. 20. тiv $\psi v \chi$ viv
 may be taken as an impersonal, as indeed almost all recent Commentators take the dé $\xi_{\infty \nu T a t ~ i n ~}^{\text {a }}$ the present passage, q.d. 'that ge may be re-
ceived.' It would seem, indeed, most natural to refer dégcovtal to the фílous before; and this is strongly confirmed by the foregoing parable, of which this is an application. Many antient and many modern Commentators (as Grot., Mald., Brug., De Dieu, and Schoetg.) take סé́ $\omega \nu \tau a \iota$ as referring to those $\phi(\lambda 01$, with allusion to a Jewish dogma to this effect. "The rich assist the poor in this world with their riches; the poor the rich, in another world, with their bodies and souls." But it seems better to suppose the sense to be, ' Make to yourselves friends by relieving the poor and destitute, that those whom you have thus befriended may, by their prayers and intercessions, be a means of your being received into heaven,' i. e. may contribute to your reception. And this view has been ably maintained and vindicated by Mr. Scott, and, in an eloquent sermon, by Mr. Le Bas. After all, however, this interpretation is more justifiable Theologically than Philologically; and I must still acquiesce in that recommended in Recens. Synop. $\Delta e ́ E c o v \tau \alpha t ~ i s, ~ s t r i c t l y ~ s p e a k i n g, ~ n o t ~ u s e d ~$ impersonally, but has reference to the $\phi$ inous before; and the plural there is used with accommodation to the foregoing parable, namely, the friends made by the crafty steward. Besides, фìhoy moteíalat seems to be an Hellenistic phrase, denoting to make interest ; though something nearly approaching to it occurs in the Classical writers, e. gr. Thucyd. i. 28. Thus we say to make friends with, or to be friends with any one. Had it not been for the accommodation in question, $\phi \Delta \lambda d \nu$ would have been written, and consequently also $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \xi \eta \tau \alpha \iota$; for the hearer or reader is supposed to be well aware, that the person wlth whom this interest is to be acquired is God. The sense, therefore, is, 'Do ye [in like manner as the steward made friends with the tenants] make friends [with God] by means of those riches which are so often acquired or employed wrongly,' viz. by their right distribution, in order that when ye fail [and your stewardship expires] the interest ye have thus acquired may be a means of your being admitted to the eternal abodes [the mansions of the blessed]. In almuious oKnvas there is meant to be an opposition, of solid and lasting houses, to the temporary and frail tents of this world.
10. $\dot{\delta}$ riords-c $\sigma \tau(\nu$ ] This is an adagial saying, (found also in the Rabbinical writers), to be understood only of what generally happens. On which principle masters act, who, after proving the fidelity of servants in small matters, at length confide more important business to their care. Our Lord, however, proceeds to give it an application as respects the comparative importance of the riches of this world, and those of heaven, q. d. As he who is faithful in small matters, \&cc., so he who has misapplied the riches committed to his stewardship, \&c.
11. Tis] By implication, no one, i. e. God will not. Td $d \lambda_{\eta} \theta \iota v d \nu$, 'the true riches,' i. e. the
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favour of God and admission to the eternal man－ sions of bliss．So said in opposition to the riches of the world，which are but a vain show，and promise what they never perform．

12．el $d \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \dot{d} \lambda \lambda \lambda o \tau \rho[\varphi-\dot{\nu} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu]$ This is only another mode of expressing the same thing as in the preceding verses，by considering it in another view．By $\tau d d \lambda \lambda o \tau \rho i o n$ are meant the goods of this life only，so called because they are，strictly speaking，not our own，but only committed to us as stewards．So Clem．Rom．ii．5．cited by Wets． enjoins us тà кобцıка̇ таūta cis à入入óтрta
 èpérepov are meant the riches of an eternal in－ heritance in heaven，called our own，because lst，the possession of it is secured to us on cer－ tain conditions；2dly，it will be wholly our own， and not to be shared with others．

13．See Note on Matt．vi． 24.
 тпрi乌el（from $\mu$ uктip，the nose）properly sig－ nifies to turn up the nose；a metaphor used in most languages to designate derision，and some－ times contempt．

15．ठiкatoüvese 8.$]$ This expression（which is variously interpreted）designates their arro－ gating to themselves a virtue and sanctity not really their＇s．Thus $\delta$ ıкatoos is taken，like the Hiphil conjugation in Hebrew for＇to make［one
 for concrete．Of course，this enunciation must be restricted to what went before，and denote the pomp of ceremonious observances，which serves as a cloak to vice．

16－18．On these verses，see Note on Matt．xi． 12 \＆13．v． 18 \＆32．and on the connexion with the preceding，see Grot．，Whitby，and Doddr．

19．${ }^{2} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi=s \delta_{\varepsilon} \tau t s, \& c$ ．］It has been dis－ puted，both among antient and modern Commen－ tators，whether the following narration be a real history，or merely a story，or something com－ posed of both，i．e．founded on fact，but adorned with colouring and imagery．The best Commen－ tators，both antient（as Theophyl．and Euthym．） and modern（as Lightf．，Whitby，Doddr．Ro－ senm．，and Kuin．），with reason consider it as a parable，since all the circumstances seem para－ bolical，and a story very similar to it is found in the Babylonian Gemara．The scope of the pa－ rable is too obvious to need explanation．
－по $\rho \phi \dot{\prime} \rho a \nu$ ］The use of purple vestments was originally confined to Kings，but had gra－ dually extended itself to the noble and rich．On this，and the nature and species of Byssus among the antients，see Recens．Synop．
20．$\pi$ rcox $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{s}}$ ］Not so much a beggar，as a poor destitute person．＇E $\beta$＇$\beta \lambda \eta \pi \tau$ ，\＆cc．，＇was stretched out at，＇\＆c．See Note on Matt．viii．6．The portal of a rich man was，for many reasons，a frequent resort of such．In which view Wets． cites Hom．Od．p．336．\＆II．к．25．This still continues to be the case in Italy and elsewhere． This would seem to have been the usual place where Lazarus was laid．See Note on Acts iii． 2. ＇H $\lambda$ coш $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu \mathrm{os}$ ，＇full of sores，＇as beggars often are．
21．$\dot{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \pi . \theta v \mu \bar{\omega} \nu}$ хорт．］It has been much de－ bated among the Commentators whether $d \pi i \theta v$－ $\mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ signifies desiring，or who desired，or who was glad，or fain．The former interpretation has been generally maintained by antient and mo－ dern Commentators；but the latter has been adopted by Elsn．，Parkh．，Campb．，and others， whose reasons，however，are of no great weight．











For ${ }^{2} \gamma a \pi \bar{a} y$, though used in this sense by the Classical writers, is never by the Scriptural ones ; and ex $\boldsymbol{i} \theta \nu \mu$ in no where occurs in that sense in the Classical, nor, I believe in the Scriptural writers; for as to Luke xv. 16, see the Note, there. Now the difference between 'I was fain,' and 'I would fain,' is to be attended to. The former signifies, 'I was glad,' (for fain comes from the ing. Sax. feagen, glad), which implies a sort of compulsion for fear of worse; the latter (in which fain is an adverb) signifies 'I would gladly do,' or have done, a thing. Now although in both these passages of Luke, the former signification would yield a tolerable sense, yet as that is not established on any certain authority, either Classical or Scriptural, it must not be adopted. The question is, whether the latter signification is to be adopted in these two passages, or the ordinary one to desire. It should seem that the same signification will not serve for both. Our common Translators have, I think, done right in adopting the sense 'he would fain' in the former ; and have rightly retained the ordinary significacion in the latter. In the former, ex et $\dot{v} \mu \in t$ is, by a common idiom, for ex exe日úpet $\dot{\alpha} v$, literally, ' he would have desired, (i. e. if he could have brought his stomach to admit such distasteful food) to fill his belly,' q. d. he would fain have filled, \&c. But in the latter case it is simply desire, or wish that is expressed. His desire, in being laid there, was to be fed \&c. The taking his post there was a sort of begging by action. That this his desire was not fulfilled, is not only not implied in the term itself, but is, as Camp. shows, inconsistent with the circumstances of the narrative. Bornem. rightly takes this ere $\theta$. for qua cupiebat.
 Mart vii. 28. and Notes.
21. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ cal oi кúves. \&c.] This must not, with some, be considered as meant to note an alleviation of his sufferings, though the tongue of a dog is known to be healing, but only (as Euthym. and Doddr. remark, ' to represent his helpless and miserable condition, (with his ulcers bare, neither bound up, nor mollified with ointment), and consequently the inhuman neglect of the rich man. 'Ala $\kappa a l$, quinetiam, nay even. 'Aтe入ecxov, 'used to lick.'
 The more recent Commentators think that the simple idea, of Lazarus being removed to supreme felicity in heaven, is adorned with imagery agreeable to the opinions of the Jews, which are illus-
rated by Wets., Schoetg., and others, cited or referred to in Recent. Synop., from which it appears that the same notions prevailed among the Greeks and Romans. Now if there had been only the circumstance of his being carried by the angels to the place of eternal bliss, that, however, agreeable to the notions of the Jews, would have some countenance for it in our Lord's words, especially, " as this office (Doddr. remarks) would be suitable to their benevolent natures, and to the circumstances of a departed spirit." But when we consider the many other circumstances connected with it, as the aixeve-
 has reference to the Oriental custom of reclining at table, by which the head of a person sitting next him who was at the top of the triclinium was brought almost into his lap), and that, according to the Jewish opinions, angels were employed to convey the bad to hell, as well as the good to heaven, it cannot but seem that the former view is the most correct. Yet it is to be borne in mind, that no responsibility on our Lord's part is involved in this case, as in that of the Damoniacs ; for our best Commentators and Theologians are agreed, that in parabolical marrations, provided the doctrines inculcated be strictly true, the terms in which they are expressed may be adapted to the prevailing notions of those to whom they are addressed. See Grot., Dodder., and Mackn.
 indeed, it is commonly supposed, that the word denotes the place of torment. But that this is, strictly speaking, not the case, has been shown by several able Commentators, as Wets., Camp., Rosenm., and others, whom see in Recens. Synop. They have proved that the Jews (as well as the Greeks) supposed the place of departed souls to be divided into two parts, Paradise and Gehenna, which were contiguous to each other, but separated by an impassable chasm, so narrow, however, that there was a prospect of one from the other; nay that their respective inmates could converse with each other. Thus both the rich man and Lazarus might be alike in Hades, though in different parts. Rosenm. observes, that both the Jews and Greeks thought that the souls of departed persons were in all things as if they were embodied, conversing and in other respects occupied as the inhabitants of the world. See the numerous citations in Recens. Syn.
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25. öde] Very many MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Edd., have wie, which is edited by Matth. and Scholz. But though this may seem agreeable to a well known canon, yet that does not apply to words exceedingly similar and often confounded; in which case, too, manuscript authority is small. Propriety then must decide; and that here requires the öf. Bornem. thinks the true reading is $\ddot{0} \delta \epsilon \dot{\omega}^{\dot{0}} \boldsymbol{\delta} \epsilon$.

- $\sigma \dot{\nu}$ ] This is omitted in several MSS., Versions, and Fathers, and is cancelled by Griesb., Tittm., and Scholz; but without reason; for besides that the antithesis requires the $\sigma \dot{v}$, and the insufficiency of the evidence for cancelling it, (that of Versions being in a case like this but slender), we can account for its omission in tuo ways ; forits insertion, in one only, and that not a very probable one.

28. dıaцартípŋтat] i.e. as Schleus. and Campb. explain, uarn, admonish, seriously erhort ; or we may conjoin both senses, and render seriously admonish, by bearing vitness of these truths.
29. Mшбéa nai toùs троф.] i. e. generally the sacred books of the Jews (as in Matt. xvii. 5.) all revealing, more or less clearly, the doctrine of a future life, and a state of rewards and punishments.
30. oux ${ }^{1]}$ The construction is elliptical. We must supply doovooover, ' they will not attend to them, they will slight them,' as I did.
 themselves confessed that the Law was delivered to them by God, and confirmed by manifest and signal miracles, the report of which, as handed down to them from their ancestors, they had re-
ceived. Yet they led a life contrary to the plain injunctions of the law. Nothing, therefore, hindered their reformation but a perverse mind, unwilling to embrace, as true, what they could not prove to be false. (Rosenm.) The passage may be thus paraphrased; "Occasions of repentance and reformation are not wanting to them. If, therefore, they will not embrace these, not even miracles could move their perverse and stubborn wills." See more in Doddr. and Campb.
 which occurs in Luke xiii. 33. , and denotes what necessarily must happen, from the condition of man. See Matt. xviii. 7. and Note. Before $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta_{\text {civ many MSS., Fathers, and early Edd. have }}$ roū, which, as it is agreeable to the usage of Luke, is probably genuine, and thus we may render literally, 'it is impossible for offences not to come.' Yet as it may have been derived from the margin, I cannot venture to insert it. $\Delta i^{\prime}$ oi, 'through whose means.'
In the following portions there is no occasion to perplex ourselves about the connexion, since, as the best Commentators have observed, the discourse is formed of detached admonitions, and consequently no connexion is intended.
31. $\lambda v \sigma เ \tau \in \lambda \in i]$ Here there is the frequent ellipse of $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$.
32. е́ $\pi$ raкıs] for тод入áкıs; a frequent $\mathrm{He}-$ brew idiom. The $\dot{e} \pi i \sigma \epsilon$ after $\delta \pi \kappa \sigma \tau \rho \in \neq \eta$ is omitted in very many MSS., Versions, and Fa thers, and is cancelled by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. But the evidence for it (or the correction upon it trods $\sigma e$ ) is so strong, and its antiquity so great, that it is more probable that the words were omitted by some over
avow. áф ${ }^{\prime} \sigma e t s ~ a u ̛ \tau \bar{\psi}$.
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nice Critics, to remove what seemed an offensive repetition, than that it should have been brought in to complete the sense. Such sort of tautology as this strengthens the sense, and is found in the best writers.
33. бокамivo] i. e. the ficus sycamorus of Linnaeus, a tree whose leaves resemble those of the mulberry, and its fruit that of the fig-tree. It is found in Egypt and Palestine, and is so called as resembling the fig-tree in its fruit, and the mulberry in its leaf.
34. dvaжєन at] 'seat thyself at table.'
35. фब́yegat cal miєбal] These are, as Wets. observes, 2 pers. Fut. Mid. for $\phi a \dot{\gamma} \boldsymbol{n}$ and ring, according to the early usage, (which, it seems continued in the common dialect to a late period,) whereby фá $\gamma o \mu a t$ and ríopat were used for фауойдаı and rıoüpat. See Math. Gr. Gr. 6 197. 1. and Butm. Gr. Gr. p. 244. With respect to the doctrine contained in ver. 7-10, it is plainly this, that the rewards held out to Christian obedience are not of merit, but purely of grace.
36. aúrч̄] This is omitted in nearly all the best MSS., and in several Fathers and early Ld., and is with reason cancelled by almost every Editor from Beng. to Scholz.
 of this expression the Commentators are in doubt, since Samaria and Galilee seem to be mentioned in a manner the reverse of their geographical
position. But it should rather seem that no nolice is meant of that position, and that Grot., De Dies, Wets., Camps., and others, have rightly supposed that our Lord did not proceed by the direct way (namely, through Samaria) to Jerusalem, but that, upon coming to the confines of Samaria and Galilee, he diverged to the east, so as to have Samaria on the right, and Galilee on the left. Thus he seems to have passed the Jordan at Scythopolis, (where there was a bridge), and to have descended along the bank on the Peræan side, until he again crossed the river, when he came opposite to Jericho. The reason which induced our Lord to take this route was (as Wets. conjectures) both to avoid any molestation from the Samaritans, and at the same time to make a greater number of Jews partakers of his benefits.
37. cicepxopévov au̇roū] 'as he was entering,' i. e. about to enter; for lepers were not allowed to enter the towns. IÍój́po日ev. No doubt, within the distance, whatever it was, (for on that the Rabbin are not agreed), at which lepers were obliged to stand apart from others.
38. lois iepeṽ ${ }^{2}$ ] This is either meant (as Grot. and others think) to be taken in a collective sense; or, with Wets., we may suppose the priests of both Jews and Samaritans. But the former is far more probable. On the circumstances of the narrative, see Futhym., cited in Recent. Synop.
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17. oi déca] i.e. the whole ten.
18. dג入oy $\in \nu \dot{\eta}$ ] foreigner. Such the Samaritans were esteemed by the Jews; and Josephus calls them $\alpha \lambda \lambda o e \theta \nu e i s$. Whether they were to be regarded as Gentiles, was a disputed question among the Rabbis. That they were not heathens, is certain ; but the Jews took advantage of some approach to idolatry in the worship at Mount Gerizim to regard them as such.
20. $\mu е \tau \alpha \pi \alpha \rho a \tau \eta \rho \dot{j} \sigma e \omega s$ ] On the sense of this expression Commentators are not agreed. The word mapar. is indeed rare; but four examples are adduced from the later writers, in which the sense is, attention, observation. But as this signification does not seem suitable here, many recent Commentators render it splendour, pomp, parade. That, however, is rather an interpretasion than a version. It may be more literally taken, by metonymy, to denote what attracts obsercatim.
21. ̇urds ímcion è.] ' is among you.' q.d. the kingdom of the Messiah has even commenced
among you (i.e. in your own country and among your own people) though ye do not see it. So

 world.' The ellip. is found in the LXX.; and the phrase $\dot{\text { in }}$ ' oiv., in this sense, is cited by Wets. from Plato and Liban.
25. dंтодoк.」 See Note on Mark viii. 31.
29. $\left.{ }^{6} \beta \rho \in \xi_{\epsilon}\right]$ Sub. $\theta \in d s$; a frequent ellips., but supplied in Gen. xix. 24. $\Pi \hat{\nu} \rho$ denotes lightning ; and such is the proper signification of $\theta$ eiov, i.e. divine fire. Thus places struck with lightning were said to be $\theta$ eia, and were set apart from human use. Since, however, in such places there are (to use the words of Lucret. vi. 219.) inusta vapore signa notaque, graves halantes sulphuris auras, and since lightning has a sulphurous smell, hence it is often used for sulphur, as here and in Apoc. xiv. 10. xix. 20. Therefore, by $\boldsymbol{\pi} \bar{\nu} \rho$ кal $\theta \in i o v$ is denoted a sulphurous fire, i. e. lightning.
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fared to the preceding context，it will import， ＇whoever shall attempt to save his life by taking refuge at Jerusalem will lose it；and whoever shall seem to risk the loss of it by neglecting to flee thither，will have it．＇This sense of Yo oo－ vein（namely to preserve）is never found in the Classical writers；but it is not unfrequent in the LXX．In the former it signifies to preserve life．

36．This verse is omitted in a great number of the best MSS．，some Versions，and several early Ed．，and is cancelled by almost all recent Editors，as an interpolation from Matthew．But as it is found in some MSS．and almost every Version of antiquity and credit，it should seem to be genuine，and only omitted accidentally， proper homazoteleuton．

37．Пoü кüpıc］scil．таüтa ̇̇бтat vel levi－ etas．

XVIII．1．To os $\tau \delta$ deil］＇on the subject of the duty＇\＆c．Of this sense of $\pi \rho d s$ with verbs of speaking and writing，Kyple adduces an example from Plutarch．Háv tote signifies con－ stantly，perseveringly，in opposition to that inter－ mission of regular duty，which arises from weari－ ness or despondency．＇Eккакєì signifies pro－ pertly＇to abandon any，thing from cowardice， laziness，or despondency．＇Such a limited sense of terms which properly denote perpetuity of action，is common in all languages，especially the Oriental ones．

2．$\tau \dot{\delta} \nu$ Өedу－ivтрето́нevos］A proverbial form，denoting the most glaring and unblushing wickedness，of which many examples are given by Elan．and Wets．，to which 1 have added others in Recens．Synop．；all of which may have originated from Mom．Od．x． 39 ．

3．iкरiкそうov］Almost all English Commen－ tutors agree in censuring the avenge of our com－
mon version，and render＇do me justice upon．＇ But the change is unnecessary，since avenge in our earlier writers has this very same sense， namely，＇to take satisfaction for an injury from or upon the injurer．＇So far from revenge form－ ing any part of the idea，even that word itself is frequently used by our old writers in the sense of taking retribution，justice by law．

4． $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{x} l}$ l X $\rho$ óvov］sail．rya，as Acts $\times x$ viii． 6. 1 Cor．vii．39．So Homs．II．$\beta$ ．299．Meเvat＇ext xpóyov．
5．els Te入os］An Hellenistic phrase（formed on the Hebr．למצה）for the Classical one doa rélous，and signifying perpetually，constantly． So ail is used in a kindred passage of Herodot． iii．119．which I have adduced in Recens．Dy－ not．Euthym．explains by $\delta t$＇ödov．＇ $\mathbf{r} \pi \omega \pi t a$－ Setv is properly a pugilistic term．It signifies 1 ． to bruise under the eyes；2．to bruise，obtundere． 3．It figuratively denotes to stun，or deave，any one by dinning in his ears，and consequently to weary him．No certain example of this sense has been adduced from the Classical writers； but it is frequent in the correspondent term in Latin，obtundere，and is probably a Latinism． Euthym．explains it by $\delta \nu \sigma \omega \pi \bar{y}$ ．

6．This dóuias for dóucos．

 choice and approved servants．＇Bowivt be understood of loud and earnest entreaty．The figure is often found in Thucyd．and the best writers，but always of reproach or expostulation． There is a difficulty attendant on the oi $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ， which the Commentators either do not touch on， or not successfully remove．Bornem．offers the best solution by taking the passage as if
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method is strongly confirmed by the context. At $\dot{\dot{\prime}} \pi^{\prime}$ aivois supply tois Ecclus. $x \times x$ xii. 18 .
 tors, agreeably to the usual sense of $\mu$ ккрootv$\mu$ eiv in the N . T., take it of God's long suffering; and consequently aicois is to be referred to those who aggrieve the righteous. That, however, would involve an unprecedented harshness, since such a sense cannot be elicited even from the context, much less any word of the text. We cannot, without violence, refer aiuiois otherwise than to $\delta \kappa \lambda$ extoits. We must therefore suppose some other sense of $\mu$ akpootuciv. And as the word signifies properly to be slow-minded, it may yery well denote to be slow in avenging or affording assistance. And in this sense the word occurs at Eccl. xxxii. 18. Sept. кal $\dot{\text { ox }}$ रifos oo
 This interpretation (wlich alone suits the scope of the parable) is adopted by almost all recent Commentators, and is confirmed by Euthym.
8. $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{j} \dot{j}$ vids- $-\bar{\eta} \mathrm{j} \delta \bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}]$ The Commentators are not agreed whether this coming of our Lord adverts to his final advent, or to his advent at the destruction of Jerusalem. The former may be defended; but the latter is so confrimed by the account which we have of the time in question, in the Epistles of James, Peter, and Paul, that it can scarcely be doubted to be the true interpretation. Of course, ris $\gamma \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ must be taken, as often, of the land of Judæa. The interrogation implies a strong negation.

It is strange that Markl. and Campb. should suppose that rijv ríarıv means 'the belief of this truth,' namely, that God will avenge his elect. Not to say that that would require triv тíarav тaúrŋn, it cannot be permitted to take riativ in the sense of belief of a truth.
9. It is strange that almost every Translator renders $\pi \in \pi n \theta$. and $\epsilon \xi$ out. in a past sense, notwithstanding that eloc requires a present. And as $\dot{\epsilon} \xi o v \theta$. is evidently a present participle, so we may be allowed to assign a present sense to $\pi \epsilon \pi o t \theta .$, for the perfect has often a present sense.
11. mpds $\dot{\varepsilon} a u \tau d \nu]$. There has been some doubt as to the construction of these words, which
some Commentators connect with $\sigma \tau \alpha \theta \epsilon i s$, in the sense 'apart, by himself;' while others construe with т $\rho$ oonuxero. The latter mode is greatly preferable; for the former proceeds on a confusion of $\pi \rho \delta \delta_{s} \dot{\epsilon} \alpha u \tau \delta \nu$ with к $\alpha \theta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \alpha \nu \tau \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}$; Meds 'aurdy can only denote ' with himself,' and is not unfrequently joined with verbs of speaking or thinking ; of which the Commentators adduce examples both from the N.T. and the later Classical writers. Era日cis is by some rendered consistens; by others is considered as added for ornament. But, as I suggested in Recens. Synop., it rather seems to refer to the posture of prayer among the Jews, namely, standing.
— ̈̈рлаүєs] "Аржаگ denotes one who injures another by force; ädsos, one who werreaches him by fraud, and a semblance of justice and equity.
12. $\delta 1 s$ т $o \bar{v} \sigma \alpha \beta \beta$.] viz. on the $2 d$ and 5th days, as appears from Wets. By these are meant not public, but private and voluntary fasts. On cimodeк. see Note on Matt. xxiii. 23.
13. $\mu \alpha \kappa \rho o ́ \theta \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \omega \dot{s}]$ Namely, in the court of the Gentiles, if he was a Pagan; or, if a Jew, placed far apart from the Pharisees.

- ouvк $\ddot{\eta} \theta \in \lambda \in \nu-\dot{\pi} \pi \bar{\alpha} \rho \alpha L]$ A fine feature of real contrition and genuine humility. Schoetg. has, indeed, shown that it was a frequent maxim with the Rabbis, that he who prays should cast down his eyes, but raise his heart to God; contrary to the custom of the Greeks and Romans, which was to lift up the eyes and hands in prayer. Yet in this picture of real contrition and genuine humility we must suppose every thing unstudied.
- étuxtev cis $\tau \boldsymbol{d} \sigma \boldsymbol{j} \hat{\eta} \theta o s]$ An action suited to grief, remorse, \&ic., and common to all nations, as appears from the copious passages adduced by Wets. and others, among which, however, I find none that sufficiently justify the construction, which appears Hellenistical, and consists in the omission of the pronoun; though the phrase, even with a personal pronoun, is very rare.
- $\mu о \iota \tau \underset{\sim}{\tilde{a}} \dot{\alpha} \mu$.] Wets. and others think that the Article is emphatical and used кar' $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{ox} \dot{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{v}$.
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But the force of the Article is better laid down by Bp．Middlet．thus：＂Whenever an attributive noun is placed in opposition with a personal pronoun，such attributive has the Article pere－ fixed．Thus in Luke vi．24．自min toils $\pi$ dougious． xi．46．уріи тоїs עоцикоīs．We have the same form of speech also in Herodot．ix．p．342．$\mu$ er
 düarnvov．See also Soph．Elect．282．Eurip． Ion．348．Aristoph．Av．5．Acharn．1154．Eccles． 619．Of the usage in question the ground is sufficiently obvious．The Article here，as else－ where，marks the assumption of its predicate； and the strict meaning of the publican＇s prayer is，＇Have mercy on me，who am confessedly a sinner；＇or，＇seeing that 1 am a sinner，have mercy on me．＇
 to be here the common ellipse of $\mu \bar{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ ．But it is better，with Rosenm．and Kun．，to suppose that，as the Hebrews often express a simple ne－ gation by a comparative，（as in Gen．xxxviii． 26. and 1 Sam．xxiv．18．）so here the sense is，that the Publican went away justified，but not the Pharisee．This view is supported by the autho－ rity of Euthym．

For $\hat{\eta}$ most of the MSS．and almost all the early Ede．have of $\gamma \dot{\text { ci }}$ ，which is approved by Mill，and adopted by almost every fititor from Wets．to Scholz．But though the more difficult
is usually to be considered the preferable rear－ ing ；yet that principle does not extend to mani－ fest violations of the propriety of the language． And，notwithstanding what those Editors say， this use of $\gamma^{\dot{a}} \rho$ cannot be defended，as appears from the vain attempts made to explain it．For to render it sane，or nimirum，or to consider it as having reference to a clause omitted，is alike objectionable．And to regard it as redundant， is puerile．The canon in question，therefore， does not apply．And as this differs so slightly from another reading，namely， $\boldsymbol{j}_{1 \pi e \rho}$ ，found in some MISS．and Basil．I cannot but consider the $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ as an error of the scribes，who had $\hat{\eta} \pi \in \rho$ in their archetypes．Whether，indeed，that be the true reading，I doubt．It seems to have been a very early correction of Luke＇s Greek． For elegance of style would require $\dot{\eta} \pi \in \rho$ ．It may be added，too，that every antient Version of credit represents $\hat{\eta}$ or $\hat{\eta} \pi \in \rho$ ，not $\hat{\eta} \gamma \dot{\gamma} \rho$ ．How $\pi \in \rho$ might be confounded with raj（especially by those who did not consider the construction） is obvious from the strong similarity between $\pi$ and $f$ and $a$ and $e$ ．That $\eta$ rather than $\eta \pi e \rho$ is the true reading，is probable from the former occurring supra xv．7．sine var．lect．
15．$\tau \alpha \beta \beta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\phi} \eta$ ］i．e．the children of the per－ sons who resorted to him．On the rest of the Chap．，see the Notes on the parallel passages of Math．and Mark．
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- غ̇кєivฑฺ] Sub. $\ddot{\delta} \delta o u$, and indeed $\delta \iota \alpha$, which, though it is found in the common text, and in very many MSS., yet is omitted in most of the untient MSS., and cancelled by almost every recent Editor. The ellip., however, is harsh ; and not to be defended by a similar one at v. 19., for, as Bornem. remarks, and I had myself long conjectured, there can be little doubt that the true reading there is moira, and here éceivy.

5. eidev aútòv, \&c.] The antient and early modern Commentators rightly refer our Lord's knowledge of the name and circumstances of Zacchaus to his Divine omniscience. For notwithstanding that several recent Commentators endeavour to account for it on natural principles, yet the former view is more agreeable to the air of the whole passage.

- $\mu$ rival] 'to sojourn.' See Note on Matt. x. 12. The Aorist is for the Present.

7. karaj $\left.\bar{v} \sigma a_{l}\right]$ ' to be a guest with. See Note on Luke ix. 12.
8. ora0cis-єime] Construe: ora0cls de $\pi \rho d s$
 chorus had been introduced into the presence of Jesus, (and had thereby an opportunity of addressing him, ) he said, sic. So Acts v. 20. oraө́́vtes 入a入eīte. and xxvii. 22.

- $\delta i \delta \partial \infty \mu$ ] ] Grot., Wets., Campo. Whitey, and others take this as Present for Future, wo denote firmness of purpose. But it is better to suppose, with Euthym., Theophyl., and Vat., the sense to be, ' 1 do [hereby] give; or with Bornem.. dare polo; agreeably to which Christ says, This day is salvation come unto thee, sic.
 dered concerning. But though that signification does occur, yet never in the phrase cit $\dot{\text { def. And }}$
although Zacchæus is just after spoken of in the third person, yet we have only to suppose that the latter clause was addressed to the by-standers, and the former to Zacchæus, whose declaration required some reply. I have pointed accordingly. T $\bar{\omega}$ ot $\kappa \omega$ is by some referred to the master of the house. But it is most natural to interpret it of the family. Compare John iv. 53. Acts x .2 .
- кaөórt] forasmuch as, inasmuch as. The Particle thus denotes cause, and, as is often the case with $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \rho$, the use here is elliptical ; q. d. Yes I do this, because \&c.

11. ठокєì aùтous, \&c.] Our Lord's words just before declared his Messiahship, and the Apostles supposed them to imply his speedy entrance upon his reign, and assuming the charater of liberator of the Jewish nation. This erroneous opinion our Lord corrects in the following parable, on which see Notes on Matt. xxv. 14. seqq.
12. eivevirs] 'one of noble birth,' like the Roman Patricians. ^aßeì غ́autē̄ $\beta a \sigma$. Whity, Campo., and Schleus. have shown, that this sigunifies 'to receive institution to a kingdom, procure for himself royalty,' i. e. in his own coontry, as was the case with Archelaus and Herod; a circumstance of great notoriety.
13. déka $\delta$. $\dot{\epsilon}$.] ten of his servants. This is merely (as Euthym. remarks) a round number. $\Pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau e v ் a \sigma \theta \epsilon$. The word signifies literally and in the Classical writers, 'to be engaged in business;' but here it is used as a deponent, in the sense ' to do business with by investment in trade. Thus $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau e u \dot{T} \eta \mathrm{~s}$ is used both in the Classical writers and the LXX. to denote a merchant. The term in Matthew is $\dot{d} \rho \gamma \dot{d}\} \epsilon \sigma \theta a u$.













 liattr 12.







14. óv $\theta \in \lambda o \mu \epsilon \nu \& c$.] The earlier Commentators say that this adverts to the case of Archelaus. But that view is liable to objections; and therefore it is better, with most recent Commentators, to regard the circumstance as introrluced ad ornatum; though, strictly speaking, it forms an interesting feature of the story.
 ofac there is the same metaphor as that by which we say 'to make money,' viz. by investment in trade. Money so employed was said to be ềvepyov; on the contrary, what was allowed to lie dormant was said to be ápyov.
15. $\boldsymbol{\tau} \sigma \boldsymbol{\theta} \stackrel{\dot{\epsilon}}{ } \xi \cdot \dot{\epsilon} \chi \omega \nu]$ This idiom is found in the Classical writers as well as the Scriptural ones. 'Enávw. This sense as denoting authority over is rare in the Classical writers, and only occurs in the later ones. There is here (as 1 remarked in Recens. Synop.) an allusion to the antient Oriental custom of assigning the government and revenues of a certain number of cities to a meritorious officer. See the examples in proof of this in Recens. Synop. and especially in my Note on Thucyd. i. 138.
16. oov $\alpha a \rho\{\varphi]$ The word is of Latin origin, and denotes such a cloth as was among the antients generally used as a kerchief, but sometimes as a napkin, i. e. little wrapper. And from the Rabbinical writers it appears that such were sometimes used to wrap money in and lay it by.
17. ajurnpos ] The word primarily, as applied to feeling, signifies dry, harsh; and, as applied to the taste, sour and crabbed; and in a metaphorical sense, severe and rynical ; or, in another view, severe and griping, which is the sense here.

The following are examples. Dio Chrys. Orat.
 Durus nimis attentusque videris esse mihi. See also i. 5, 13. \& Serm. ii. 6, 82.

- atpets ô oúк évŋкcas] A proverbial expression like Matt. Xxv. 24. Kypke observes that atpow is used of the taking up and carrying off any thing which has been found, and mentions a
 $\theta a \dot{v} \alpha$ тos $\dot{\eta}$ Y Ynuia. He and Wets. adduce other passages, from which it is clear that the pure Greek idiom requires divaıfeī $\sigma \boldsymbol{\theta}$ at. And as no example is adduced of atpeiv in the sense of carrying off and appropriating, it may be regarded as a Hebraism, though an idiom exactly corresponding to it is found in the Ang. Sax. and old English Hliftan, to lift, i.e. carry off, appropriate by theft.
 2. a money-table or counter, on which the money changers did their business. But as those counters were, no doubt, provided with desks or tillers, for the deposit of money, so $\tau \rho \alpha \pi \epsilon \zeta \alpha$ came to mean 3. a place for the invest ment of money, just as our bank originally only denoted a counter, being derived from $\alpha \beta \alpha \xi$.

Many MSS. and Edd. here omit the Article. But there is no proof that the phrase had become so common that the Article, which is properly requisite, could be dispensed with.

- $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho a \xi a]$ This sense of $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \in \iota \nu$ for exigere is found also in the Classical writers, but generally in the middle voice.

26. The Commentators are not agreed whether these are the words of our Lord, or of the King.





























According to the former interpretation, they may be supposed to be a parenthetical admonition to the disciples. This, however, would be harsh, and makes the next verse exceedingly so. The latter interpretation is therefore preferable, especially since it is required by the parallel passage in Matth. Yet it is not unattended with difficulty, which is not diminished by placing (as many Editors do) ver. 25 . in a parenthesis. Besides, the words are plainly not parenthetical. To remove this difficulty, many Commentators
 that is too arbitrary. Nor indeed can ellipsis apply to this case; which is one of those numerous instances in which $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is used in answers, and where it has, indeed, a causative force, with reference to something which has preceded, or might have preceded, as belonging to the subject. See Acts ii. 15. \& xvi. 37. Here dóre may be supposed to be referred to, or, "it is my will and pleasure,"
 doubt, from the barbarous ages, but (as appears from the (Classical citations in Wets.) retainer
by the most civilized nations of antiquity. It even yet continues in the East, which has ever been the seat of peculiar atrocity in the treatment both of criminals and of captured enemies.
28. $\dot{\epsilon \pi \rho \rho є и ́ є \tau o ~} \bar{\epsilon} \mu \pi \rho o \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu]$ ' he went forward [on his journey].'
33. oi ^úptoc à̇toū] I have shown in Recens. Synop. that the sense is, ' those who had a power over it,' including the sertants of the owner. This use of кuptos is frequent in the Classical writers.
40. oi 入íOot кекрạ́ovтat] Grot. and Wets. have shown that this is a proverbial form of expression, denoting that it is a moral impossibility for a thing to be otherwise than as it is. And they adduce several examples from the Greek and Latin writers, to which I have, in Recens. Synop., subjoined a most apposite one from
 $\lambda a \beta o c, \sum a \phi \epsilon \sigma \tau a \tau^{\prime}$ à $\nu \epsilon \in \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu \nu$. Our Lord had probably in view Habakkuk ii. 11 .
42. єi ézves] On the force of the phraseology. Commentators are divided in opinion. Some
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take el for $\epsilon i \theta_{c}$ ，＇would that thou hadst consi－ dered ；＇which use is sometimes found both in the Scriptural and Classical writers．Others suppose an ellipsis，per aposiopesin，of cos áv éxot or the like．And this view，which is adopted by most of the best Commentators，antient and mo－ dern，seems preferable．The aposiopesis is fre－ quent in language uttered under grief or any of the violent passions．Grot．has here shown that our Lord＇s weeping，while it evinces his extreme sensibility and benevolence，does not derogate from，but enhances，his dignity．I would here compare the following passage of Plut．Demosth．



－каi $\left.\gamma^{\epsilon}\right]$ et quidem．
 like．By clp．is meant felicity，salvation．
－עū̀ dè ékpúß ${ }^{2}$ ，\＆ic．］1 would paraphrase thus：＇But now，by an inexcusable ignorance， thou rejectest light offered and pressed upon thee ：and therefore perish thou must．＇
43．$\chi$ 人́paкa］＇a rampart．＇So called from
 down to preserve the agger，or mound of earth， in due form．There is here a manifest prediction，
and lively description of the siege of Jerusalem； and the accumulation of terms，тepıкиклaíovat and ouvéそouvt，designate the severity of the blockade．
 are agreed that there is in Eסaф．a syllepsis，of demolishing the building，and of dashing the inhabitants against the stones．Both senses are found in use，and both here seem to be meant．
 been some difference of opinion on the sense of $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \kappa 0 \pi y!$ here，which，as being a word of middle signification，admits both of a good and a bad sense．Some Commentators take it here in the latter，which may be defended，and that sense is elsewhere found．But the former seems more apposite，and is adopted both by Theophyl． and Euthym．，and the best modern Commenta－ tors；and this sense occurs in Job $x$ ．12．\＆ xxxiv． 9.
48．＇＇彑єкрé $\mu a \tau o$ ］＇hung on his words，＇i．e． heard him with deep interest．Of this sense of $\dot{e} \kappa \kappa \rho \epsilon \mu \bar{\alpha} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ，and the Latin pendere，examples are adduced by the Commentators，to which I add Thucyd．vii．75．and Genes．xliv． 30 ．Virg． An．iv． 79.

XX．6．ката入ıөá⿱et $\dot{\boldsymbol{\mu} \mu a ̃ s] ~ T h e ~ P r i e s t s ~ h a d ~}$
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 тои́тоия，каі $\delta \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \epsilon \lambda \omega ิ \nu \alpha ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda о \iota s . ~ \dot{\alpha} к о \dot{v} \sigma \alpha \nu \tau е s ~ \delta \dot{\epsilon}$









themselves accustomed the people to that vo－ lence．When they could not legally convict their enemies，they incited the populace to stone them by what was called the judicium sell．See Job．x．31．Acts xiv．19．（Grot．）Stoning was indeed enjoined in the Law of Moses as a punish－ ment for idolatry，blasphemy，incest，and other heinous offences，and its execution was com－ mitted to the people at large．Yet it appears from Exod．viii．23．that such sort of irregular vengeance was in use before the Law．Nor was this confined to the Jews；for we find allusions to it in Homs．Il．Y．56．and Thucyd． v． 60.
11．тробé $\theta$ ceto те́ $\mu \psi a \iota$ ］This expression，as also that at xix．11．тpog日els cire，is an Hellen－ istic idiom formed on the Hebrew，and found in Gen．viii．21．xviii．29．Job xix． 1.

13．ircos］This is commonly rendered it may be，perhaps．But Pearce，Campb．，and Schleus．，
object that that sense can have no place in the Scriptures，since the Spirit of truth could be under no doubt．Hence they would render it surely，adducing examples of that sense from the LXX．and the Classical writers，and referring to several Notes of Critics．But the difficulty started is perhaps imaginary ；for the term occurs in a parable，and may be used to keep up the verisimilitude of the story．If this be not ad－ milted，we may with Bornem．take the iowas for oimat sane，which he proves by references to Schaefer and Hermann．
20．er＇үка日étous］The word properly denotes one who is set or lies in a lurking place to watch another＇s motions，either for attacking him，or otherwise ；and，in a metaphorical sense，denotes one set as a spy，whether of words or actions． ＇Exı入aß＇́न日al，like corripere in Latin，is used of laying hold of any one＇s words for the purpose of accusation．







r Matt 17. 25.
et 22.21. et 22. 21.
Rom.



 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma i \gamma \eta \sigma \alpha \nu$.
${ }^{2}$ Matt 28.


















 $\stackrel{\text { Pa }}{14 .} 7.32$

 on the Heb. שית פנים, and denoting 'to show partiality to any one.' it occurs frequently in the LXX.
 sententia secundiariæ præmissa est, ut v. 28. et Joan xv. 6. (Bornemann.)
 elegantly used in the sense attain. Kara . is both elegant and significant. Of this turn of expression examples are adduced by Wets., to which I would add a very apposite one from

 is for катakıów, as in Pind. Nem. x. 73. where
 $\theta_{\epsilon} i \eta \nu$.
36. oüтe $\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ - $\dot{\rho} \nu \bar{\nu} \nu \tau a l]$ By this our Lord meant to impugn the Pharisaical notion of a metempsychosis. I would compare Artemid. iii.



- loá $\gamma \boldsymbol{\text { c }}$ 入oı] The Commentators are agreed that this signifies, not equal to the angels, but like unto the angels, (viz. in respect of immortality and the nature of their bodies), as in Matt. xxii. 30. cos árye入ot. The word ioáryeतos is rare; but I have adduced two examplen in Recens. Syn. The angels are called sons of God on account of their participation in Divine felicity and glory, as vioi тท̄s àaart. denotes those who are partakers in the resurrection and the future life. On which sense of vids, see Note on Matt. viii. 12. xi. 19 .
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 of these words Commentators are divided in opi－ non．Some（as Beza，Wets．，and Doddr．）re－ gard them as giving the result of our Lord＇s argument，in the sense，that＂all，however dead to us，are still living，as regards God，to whom things future are as present．＂Others，as Kypke and Campo．，consider the raj as not causal but illative，and confirmatory of the proposition，＇He is not a God of the dead，but of the living，for all （who are alive）live unto him，since death does not terminate our connexion with Him，ines－ much as He can recall us to life，and make that life immortal．＇See some interesting passages illustrative of this sentiment cited and referred to in Recens．Synop．
 thing laid up or apart，separated，dedicated，con－ secreted to God．These ava日imata were usually
displayed conspicuously in the temple，either by being hung up，or otherwise serving to adorn it．These the devotees used to bring thither， not only in the hope of future blessings from heaven，but from their gratitude for past benefits． The offerings varied according to the taste，in－ tention，or the ability of the giver，consisting of crowns，golden and silver vases，pictures， arms，\＆c．
6．taüta］Sub．data＇＇as for these things；＇or suppose，with Bornem．，an accusative absolute； though the parallel passages strongly counte－ nance the opinion of Rinck．Lucubr．Crit．p． 334．，that $\dot{a}$ is to be cancelled on the authority of several MSS．and Versions，and then a mark of interrogation placed after $\boldsymbol{\theta} \epsilon \boldsymbol{c o c i} \tau \epsilon$ ．
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9. גккатабтабias] 'Aкатабтабia denotes that unsettled state which arises from sedition and faction, wherein the laws cease to have force, and things are carried on by force and violence. The word is only found in the later Greek writers and in the LXX.
10. фó $\beta \eta \tau \rho \alpha]$ objects of terror, terrific prodigies. The meaning is plain from what follows,
 aerial phænomena.
 Sub. aùzois, (which is expressed in the parallel passage of Mark), 'that they shall be able to say at the judgment, We never heard of these things.'
15. $\sigma$ тóц $\alpha$ кal $\sigma о \phi\{a \nu]$ This. by a mixture of metonymy and hendiadys, stands for the faculty of speaking wisely and ably. It is not a mere Hebraism, since $\sigma \tau \delta \dot{\mu} \alpha$ is sometimes, though rarely, used in the Greek Classical writers, as os in the Latin.
 your persevering endurance ye will gain and preserve your lives.' For the Imperative has the force of a Future. See the Commentators, and also Glass. Phil. T. P. 286. who adduces several examples of this idiom as proceeding from the

Prophets. But the passages cited are of a different nature: so that I suspect that the true reading here is $\kappa T \dot{n} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$, which is found in several of the best MSS., and no doubt more, if carefully examined. For the difference is so small as to often escape the eye. Hence the terminations are perpetually confounded. As all the best antient Versions use the future, there is no doubt, considering how literal those Versions are, that the Translators had crijecote in their copies, which is also in several of the early Fathers. Though I have not ventured to receive it, I have affixed an obelus to the common reading.
22. $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \omega \theta$ $\left.\eta^{2} \nu a \iota\right]$ Very many MSS. have $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \eta \nu a \iota$, which is received by several Editors.
 for $\theta \lambda i \psi u s$, which is found in the parallel passage of Matth. This sense of the word occurs not only in the Sept., but also in the best Classical writers.
 MSS.
 be a Hebraism for Yet Wets. and Flsn. adduce some examples from the Classical writers, to which may be added Theophyl. Simoc. p. 129. A.

Kє $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ ．XXI．
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#### Abstract

24．татоvдéขך］Some take this to mean＇occu－ pied，＇and（consequently）profaned．And they cite Apoc．xi．2． 1 Macc．iii．52．т $\alpha$ a $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ бov  the Classical writers use the word．Others ex－ plain，＇shall be ignominiously treated．＇Thus Wets，cites Cic．ad Attic．viii．11．Conculcari miseram Italiam videbis proxima astate，et quati utriusque vi，mancipiis ex omni genere．To which I would add Eschyl．Eum．110．nai  639.  tators are not agreed on the sense of these words． Some take it to be，＇the times when the Gen－ tiles shall be visited for their sins．＇See Jer． xxvii．7．Ezek．xxi．25．xxii． 3 \＆4．xxx．3．Bui that would be supposing the words to be too enigmatical．It is better，with the antient and earlier modern Commentators，to interpret，＇the time when the number of Gentiles to be called to God shall be complete．That，however，is thought to be negatived by Rom．xi．12．seqg． And some of the best Commentators from Lightf．， Whitby，and Newton downwards，are of opinion， that the words refer to a period when the Jews shall be restored，i．e．when the times of the four great kingdoms predicted by Daniel shall have expired，and the fifth，or kingdom of Christ shall be set up in their place，when the scattered sheep of Israel should be again collected and become one fold under one shepherd，as citizens of the New Jerusalem．

25．iv dwoo［a］Not＇with perplexity，but －amidst perplexity．＇Suvoxy＇，like the Latin angustia，denotes such anriety，as holds the


mind enchained．Hence it is often associated with nouns denoting distress．＇Anopia denotes inopia consilii，the not knowing what to do． Ea入os denotes the tossing of the sea，and figu－ ratively cicil commotion．See Soph．W．d．Tyr． v．22．seqq．The reading $\eta^{\eta} \chi$ ous $\theta a \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \eta$ ，re－ ceived by Giriesb．，was a mere emendation of the antient Critics，proceeding on a misunderstand－ ing of the passage．

26．фóßou каl троббокias］A Hendiadys，for ＇a fearful expectation．＇＇ATo $\psi u$ Xóvтcov is by most Commentators explained of death ；but it seems only to mean（like $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{v} \sigma \kappa \kappa \iota \nu$ ）fainting avay，as we say to die avay．And so in Arrian Epict．iii．26．IIpordocia is often used of such an expectation as is associated with fear．

28．àaкúqaテe］àvaкúттеル is intransitive， and denotes to raise up the body，as opposed to ovyкúxтє८y in Luke xiii．4．Wets．compares Joseph．Bell．Jud．vi．8，5．ò入ıyov éxкúquytes є̀к тoù ゥéous．
 Grot．cites from Dioscorid．т $\rho \circ \beta a \lambda \lambda \in \iota \nu$ ä $\nu \forall o s$. So the Hebr． shooting forth of trees．

34．краเта́入 $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ кal $\mu \dot{\theta} \theta \eta]$ The latter term de－ notes the drunkenness itself；and the former the head－ache and stupid feeling which supervenes， and equally indisposes the mind for all serious reflection．Bapuv $\hat{\omega} \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ ．Very many MSS．and early Edd．have $\beta a \rho \eta \theta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ ，which is adopted by Wets．，Matth．，and others down to Scholz．I suspect that the $\eta$ arose from a confusion of the $u \nu$ ．

35．wis жаyls yàp è $\pi e \lambda$ ．］i．e．shall come on unexpectedly．Hayis and oкávóaloy gre．fre－
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quent images expressive of calamity (as the Hebrew רשח in Ps.lvii. 6. and 1 Macc. i. 35. v.4.) especially such as is sudden and unexpected, (as here and in Rom. xi. 9.), by which men are taken (like a beast in a trap) before they are aware. Ka日ŋ $\mu$ évous. The word denotes existing. There is reference to Jer. xxv. 29.
36. oraөฑ̄цai] This may be used, as in Luke xix. 8., of being introduced to, as a mark of honour and acceptance; or, as it is a judicial term, it may denote to be absolved or acquitted.
 perly to rise early ; 2ndly, to go about any business early; 3dly, and when followed by a preposition denoting motion towards, it denotes to go or resort to any place or person. In which sense it occurs here, and occasionally in the Sept.
XXII. 3. clovinte od $\dot{\delta}$. .] The best Commentators are agreed, that this does not imply a physical entry of Satan into Judas, but is to be understood of mental influence, and instigation. As those who obey the divine motions are said to receive the Spirit as a divine guest ; so Satan is said to enter into those who consent unto criminal suggestions. See Joh. xiii. 2. Acts v. 9. Ephes. ii. 2. Consult the Notes on Math. iii. 16. iv. 1. Lu.ii. 27. This view does not at all negative the personality of Satan ; since that is implied.

The Article before $\Sigma \alpha \tau$. is omitted in many MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by Griesb., Vat., Tittm. and Scholz; but without reason; for though the word, as partaking of the nature both of a proper name, and an appellative, may either admit, or reject it; yet as here threefourths of the MSS. have it, and as it is almost always found in the N. T. except in the vocative case, it must here be retained.
4. orpatทroīs] scil. тoü iepoū. On the meaning of this, Commentators somewhat vary in opinion. But I agree with Bp. Middlet. on Acts iv. 1. that the most probable view is that of Lightf., who has shown from Jewish writers that in various parts of the Temple bodies of Levites constantly mounted guard. The persons commanding these several parties were called $\sigma \tau \rho a-$ tryol; but that, besides these, there was an officer, who had the supreme authority over all of them; and this is he whom Lightf. supposes to be called by way of eminence $\dot{\delta} \sigma \tau \rho a \tau n \gamma d s$ toù lepoû at Actsiv. 1.
6. є $\left.\xi \cos \mu \boldsymbol{\lambda}{ }^{\circ} \gamma \eta \sigma \epsilon\right]$ The word properly signifies to say the same thing with any one; and 2ndly, as here, to agree with, attend to what he proposes; a signification found in the best Classical writers. "OXhov, tumult, as we say a mob.
11. olxodeõóty Tท̂s olxias] Bornem. com-

 similar pleonasms.


 $\mu a \sigma a \nu$ тó $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \sigma \chi a$.
























#### Abstract

 of expression, as in Gen. xxxi. 30. $\dot{\varepsilon \pi t \theta v \mu i \alpha}$ yaj  Blackwall, and even Winer and Bornem., produce what they think similar phrases from the Greek writers, but which are not quite similar. For in Hebrew this idiom has a strongly intensice force; but scarcely ever so in the Greek Classics. As to $\delta \rho о \mu \varphi$ Oeìv, cited from Xenoph. by Bornem., it does not fall under this class. 16. "̈cos örou] The expression (which seems a Hebraism) imports that our Lord would have no further society with them on earth. The thing to be completed was the work of human redemption by the sacrifice of Christ. Examples of a similar association of negatives are adduced by Bornem. 19. roùto тосеite, \&rc.] Schoettg. cites various Rabbinical passages, which testify in a remarkable manner that the antient Jewish Church in celebrating the Paschal feast, always had in view the sufferings of the Messiah. 20. тойто тd-iкXuyóцеуоע] Bornem., after a minute discussion of the sense, lays it down as follows: "Hoc poculum, quod vestram in salutem effunditur, signum est novi foderis per sanguinem meum sanciendi."  saying ' the person is at the table with me.'


22. торси́etal] Both the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin writers use verbs of departing, by euphemism, to denote death.
23. Tis sin] 'who it might be.'
 the difference of circumstances, notwithstanding the identity of the thing itself, some Commentators maintain that this represents an occurrence distinct from that recorded at Matt. xx. 20. and Mark x. 35. But (as Doddr. remarks) " we cannot suppose such a contention for superiority should have occurred immediately after so affecting a lesson of humility;" and many eminent Commentators are of opinion that this is the same circumstance with that mentioned by Matthew and Mark, but here brought in out of the regular order, of which Luke is less observant than the other Evangelists. And as Mathew and Mark tell us that the contention took place in the way, before they came to. Jerusalem, or even Jericho, they take $\begin{gathered}\text { yfvero } \\ \text { in a pluperfect }\end{gathered}$ sense, 'there had been,' viz. on the road to Jericho. At the rd here and just before sub. кatá.
 among the Greeks a title of honour, assigned to all who had deserved well of the monarch or state, defended its liberties, or increased its honour.
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26. où oütcos] Sub. moteite., or rather Ërerte or evté.

- $\dot{\delta} \mu \in i\} \omega \nu]$ From the antithetical word עєw't. I'his has been by some supposed to denote ' one who is elder,' like the Latin major. But from the parallel passage of Matthew it is plain that vewit. is rather to be accommodated to $\mu \in i \zeta \omega \nu$ than vice versâ; and Kypke has adduced many Classical authorities for veẃrepos in the sense of an inferior. He shows that the expressions employed throughout have reference to office, or station in the kingdom of Christ.
 frequent in the N.T.

29. ঠıaтiӨєцai $\dot{\text {. }}$.] The best Interpreters, antient and modern, are of opinion that the sense of $\delta$ aciti0. here is engage for, or promise; but just after it must have the further removed sense of grant or bestou. The former is found in the Sept., the latter sprang from the usual sense of covenanting, which implies something granted.
30. кatioco日e] So for кationote. many of the best MSS., which is received by Wets., Matth., Griesb., and others, and rightly. See Bornem.
 require any one to be delivered to one, whether for good, or (as here) for evil. See examples in Recens. Synop. The sense is, 'Satan desires to get you into his power.' Toû $\sigma \iota \nu \iota \dot{\sigma} \sigma a t$. 乏ıvıd́ $\zeta_{\epsilon \epsilon \nu}$, from $\sigma \iota v i o v$, a sieve, signifies to sift, or winnow; and as that supposes agitation, commotion, and separation, so most Commentators think it denotes perturb, loosen, undermine, and overthrow your fidelity. But the sense suggested
by our common version is more apt, namely, sift you, scrutinize, or try your fidelity, faith, and constancy.
31. $\varepsilon \pi \iota \sigma \tau \rho \in ́ \psi a s]$ neuter for reciprocal. The sense is, 'Having recovered thyself [namely from that lapse, which will happen to thee] by a sincere repentance.'
32. $\pi \omega \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha \dot{\tau} \omega-\mu \alpha \chi \alpha \iota \rho \alpha \nu]$ Some Commentators stumble at these words, not being able to reconcile them with our Lord's pacific admonitions elsewhere, and his own non-resistance when apprehended by the soldiers. Hence they resort either to vain conjectures, or harsh interpretations, alike unnecessary ; since (as Grot., Wets., and other eminent modern Commentators have seen) this and the preceding phrases contain nothing more than a prediction of impending perils, which are opposed to the quiet and security of former times. The Prophets (they observe) are accustomed to metaphorically signify perilous times by representing what men then commonly do, in order to guard against danger.

The expression $\pi \omega \lambda \eta \sigma \alpha \tau \omega \tau \delta{ }_{j}$. is a proverbial form, by which a thing is counselled to be done at any rate. It is strange the Commentators should have adduced no examples of this mode of speaking. I have noted some from the purest Attic writers; e. gr. Thucyd. viii. 81.
 $\dot{\epsilon} \xi a \rho \gamma \cup \bar{\omega} \sigma a \iota$. Xen. Anab. vii. 5, 5. каl троб-
 ठо́мєуоs тà баvтой імáтıa.
37. Grot. paraphrases the verse thus: 'After the many other evils endured by me, the last













 Heb. a 7.


now remains, namely, that I should be brought to an ignominious death. And my lot will extend to you also $;$. for the ignominy and hatred encountered by the master, will be visited on you his disciples.' Té dos ex $\chi \in \iota$. This is synonymons with $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a t$, and is used by the best Classical writers of the completion of prediclions. Wets. and Kypke cite many examples,


38. ikavóv є́नтi] The Commentators are not agreed on the sense of this expression. Some take ixaydy to mean, 'sufficient for a symbol of hostility.' But that would suppose the words too enigmatical. Others think there is an irony: which, however, would be suitable neither to the period nor the season. Almost all the best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed that ixavóv éort is here used in a sense not unfrequant in that and similar expressions in all languages, and which is employed on occasions when we do not care to rectify a stupid misapprehension, but dismiss both the person and the thing with " It is very well:" "that will do." What is decisive of the matter is, that the phrase is not only cited from the Classical writers, but very many examples are adduced from the Rabbins.
41. ix є proripuit se. But the more eminent, both ancient and modern, are of opinion that no violence is implied, observing, that both the Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans used many words which properly have a notion of violence with a considerable diminution, and sometimes an entire abandonment of that sense. They render, 'he withdrew himself from them;' adducing several examples, the most apposite of which is 2 Macc. xii. 10. To which I add Thucyd. vii. 80. $\alpha \pi e-$ वसáбө on Lucian i. 256.

- $\left.\lambda_{i} \theta_{00} \beta o \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu\right]$ A rough mode of estimating distance, which originated in the simplicity of primitive times, and was afterwards retained in the common dialect, and even found its way into the best writers.

43, 44. These verses are rejected by some Critics. But as the external evidence for their omission is next to nothing, and the internal very slender and precarious; and as their omission is far easier to account for than their insertion, they may justly be regarded as genine.

- ©̈бєє $\theta \rho o ́ \mu \beta o \iota ~ a l \mu a \tau o s] ~ M a n y ~ C o m m e n t a-~$ tors have imagined that our Lord's sweat was actually blood, or bloody, and have adduced examples of this phenomenon. But the best antient and modern Commentators (especially the recent ones) are with reason of opinion that the sense is, 'his sweat became like clots of blood.' And this the words themselves demand. Compare Acts ix. 19. Theophyl., indeed, remarks that it is a proverbial expression applied to any one who labours excessively, oft alma "סopwoc. And that interpretation is ably supported by Phot. Epist. 138. It is, however, not so satisfactory as the preceding one. After all, indeed, those who understand it of a sanguineous appearance in the sweat may be right; for the numerous references in Recens. Synop. decidedly prove, that sanguineous drops sometimes attend extreme mental perturbation. And the interprestation is strongly supported by a citation from a medical writer, Blainville, cited in the British Critic for 1831. P. I.
 of the expressions may best be understood by considering, that extreme grief has a stupifying tendency, which tends to a sort of heavy, though unrefreshing sleep; an effect which is alluded to in various passages of the Classical writers cited by Wets.
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49. єi татג́\}ouєע] El has the sense num, as in Mark viii. 23. (where see Note) and elsewhere. 'Ey is said by the Commentators to be here put for oiv. But no good writers use oiv in the sense of the instrumental cause; as here ; whereas $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ is sometimes found in that sense, though in the writers of the N.T. it, no doubt, proceeded from Hebraism.
51. غ́āte écos roúrov] Commentators are not agreed on the sense of these words, which are, from brevity, obscure, and admit of two different interpretations, whether as supposed to be addressed to the multitude, (i. e. the soldiers and others) or to the disciples. According to the former, the sense is, ' leave me free till I shall have healed the wounded man.' That, however, requires many harsh ellipses, and yields a sense liable to serious objection. According to the latter, which is supported by the best Commentators, both antient and modern, the sense is, (by an ellipse of aíroùs after dā $\tau \epsilon$,) ' let them alone,' 'be content with this violence.' Others interpret otherwise. But the ellipse of aivous is harsh, as is also that at ecos roúrou. It is strange that none of the Commentators should have seen, that the true ellipee after dā̃e is $\tau \boldsymbol{j}$, жpā $\gamma \mu a$. So Matt. xxvii. 49. Aфes, " let alone." There is also a constructio pregnans, as in Thucyd. i. 71 .

sense, then, is: 'Let the thing alone [after its having proceeded] thus far!'
53. did $\lambda^{\prime}$ aü't a certain obscurity, arising from the sense being but imperfectly developed, through intensity of feeling. Some take the words to mean, 'This is the time most opportune for your purpose ; this is the hour fit for deeds of darkness.' An interpretation supported by several paseages from the Latin Classics. Others explain, This is the time destined and permitted by God, and this is the power of iniquity,' i. e. iniquity has obtained this power a aürn coort being supplied before égovaia. Thus $\sigma$ кóros is as it were personified, as in 2 Cor. vi. 14. and Col. i. 13. Compare also Matt. xxvi. 45 \& 56 . The latter interpretation seems preferable.
56. $\alpha \tau \epsilon \nu\{\sigma a \sigma a$ aúтఱ̄] 'Aтєvi̧ctv signifies 'to fix oneself intently;' and, with $\boldsymbol{o} \mu \mu a \sigma t$ or $\delta \phi$ $\theta a \lambda_{\mu}$ ois, to fix one's view intently. But the words ồ $\mu \mu a \sigma \iota$, or $\delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o i ̄ s$, are almost always left to be understood, and the object of view is expressed either by an Accus. with els, (as in Acts i. 10. iii. 4.) or with a Dat. without a preposition, as here and in Luke iv. 20.
58. au日pcorre] This, like the homo of the Latin, and our man, is a term of expostulation.
59. $\delta i \ddot{\sigma} \chi \cup \rho i \zeta \epsilon \tau 0]$ 'strongly affirmed.'
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[^16]followers. "Hyayov (instead of ${ }^{\eta} \gamma^{a} \gamma_{\epsilon \nu}$ ) which is found in almost all the best MSS. and supported by the Ed. Pr., is adopted by moat Editors.
2. т. eйpousv 8.] Eujpianco is here a forensic term denoting conviction on legal examination. See examples of this sense in Kypke and Schleus.
4. oùdè civíaceo aitoov Alton is properly an adjective neuter, from altos, denoting worthy of, or the cause of, and, when used in a judicial sense, signifies worthy of blame, and consequently of punishment.
 ' remisit,' to use the corresponding term in the Roman law. "It was (observes Grot.) the regular practice of the Roman law to transmit or remove the prisoner to the governor of the province or district to which he belonged, though




























they had the right of trying all offences within their own province."
11. $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \epsilon \dot{\prime} \mu \alpha \sigma \tau \nu]$ sntellites, i. e. his body guards, as in Acts xxiii. 10. More than those Pilate would not have allowed him to bring.
12. évévòto фìiot] 'were [made] friends.' M. Saurin thinks, that the reconciliation of Herod and Pilate was more wonderful than their enmity. The ænigma, however, is solved by the profound remark of the Stagirite: " It constitutes much to the formation of friendship, or to the recovery of it, to either love or hate the same person ; to be engaged, no matter how, as colleagues in the same business." Compare Xischyl. Agam. 659.

 $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi^{\prime \prime}{ }^{3} x^{\theta} \mu a$, as Thucyd. i. 69. Schleus. and Kuin. say that $\pi$ роӥт. has the force of an adverb, here and at Acts viii. 9. But, in fact, ínapx. here follows the construction of $\tau \dot{\gamma} \gamma \chi^{\alpha} \nu e c \nu$, and $\begin{gathered}\text { oै } \\ \text { ves }\end{gathered}$ could not be dispensed with. For though we may
 The full sense is, ' They had been living at enmity.'


Kaíapos, ' from their allegiance to Cæsar.' So
 $\boldsymbol{i} \pi \dot{d}$ Kuplou.
 of which idiom many examples are adduced by Raphel and Wets. from the best writers.
16. тaıòeúaas] ' having chastized.' Taıòéés properly signifies to educate a child, and then, by an easy transition, to correct, either generally, or in some manner expressed, or understood. Here correction by flagellation is meant. Compare Acts xvi. 22.
 the Latin opus habere, yet occasionally found in the later Classical writers. The kind of necessity will depend upon the context. Here that of custom is meant.
21. Exeфwivoul] The word denotes responsive shouting. חa $\mu \pi \lambda \eta \theta \epsilon i$ just before signifies 'in full chorus.' The word is found in Xen., Demosth., and other authors.
23. éxiéccuvio] ' were very pressing and urgent with him.' See examples of this sense in Kyple, and Krebs.
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#### Abstract

24. dxéкрıve] The word denotes the final adjudication or decree of a judge. 25. aürois ] This is omitted in many MSS. \&c. and is cancelled by Griesb., Knapp, and Scholz; but rashly-for more causes may be imagined for the omission than the insertion of the word. See Rinck. Lucub. Crit. p. 336. 26. sou ed $\rho x$.] The $\tau o \bar{u}$ is omitted in most MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by almost all Editors, and likewise by Middlet. Propriety of language will not admit it, and it seems to have arisen from the sou preceding. 27. кal yuvacoū̀] 'even of women.' 28. $\mu \eta$ к $\lambda a i \epsilon \tau \epsilon]$ 'weep not so much for me  which is supported by Lit. xix. 41. and by general Classical usage. But the other is confirmed by that of the LXX. 29. $\mu a \kappa \alpha ́ \rho t a t-\dot{1} \theta \dot{\eta} \lambda a \sigma a \nu]$ A most awful prodiction, and how exactly fulfilled the horrible narrative of their own Historian amply testifies. At lois opera \&c. there is an image of calamity the most terrible. Examples of this sentiment are found in the O.T. Thus Wets. cites Is. ii. 19. Hos. x. 8. Apoc. vi. 16. ix. 6. and adds several passages also from the Classical writers. The force of this figurative language is to express, that they will seek any shelter, even in subterraneous caves. That this shelter was frequently sought in the Jewish war, is attested by Josephus. See B. J. vi. 33. \& iv. 9, 4.  of expression ; for (as we find by Ps. i. 3. Ez. xx. 47. Eccls.vi. 3. and especially the Rabbinical writers) the Hebrews were accustomed to figuratively call the righteous green trees, and


the wicked dry ones. Hence the sense here is: ' If the innocent and righteous be thus cut off, what may not be expected to befal the wicked and disobedient at the day of visitation which impends over you. Of छúdov in the sense tree there are many examples, both in Classical and Hellenistic Greek.
32. ท้үоขто ò̀ каl étcpo九 dúo как.] Most Commentators think that Christ is here reckoned among malefactors, not as being such, but only as being so considered and treated by the Jews. But it is better to avoid this harsh interpretation by pointing (with Steph., Mack., Kypke, Rosenm., Stor, Kuin., and Gratz) thus, óvo, какойр $о$, since it is plain that как. is not in concord with er $\epsilon \rho \circ \frac{1}{}$, but in apposition with какой $\gamma$ о . If this punctuation be adopted, there will be an ellipse of övtes or oitcues loan. That, however, would be somewhat harsh, and is indeed unnecessary, since an apposition of this kind requires no comma before it. See the two examples which 1 have adduced in Recens. Synop. from Aristoph. I add Thucyd. iv. 67.

By какой $\gamma$ oc I have in Recent. Synop. shown there is reason to think is meant lawless insurgents, bands of whom, like the Spanish Guerillas, used then to carry on petty hostilities with the Romans.
34. тátep, aides aütoîs \&c.] Grot. here remarks, that much may be pleaded in extenuation of the crime of the people at large, especially in their ignorance of the real nature of the person whom they so injuriously treated. The Philosophers (he shows) considered ignorance, if not an excuse for crime, an extenuation of the guilt. To his citations from the Classical writers may be
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added many others which I have adduced on the same subject in a Note on Thucyd. iii. 4. (Transl.) For the chief priests and others there could be little or no excuse; but then the more magnanimous must our Lord's conduct be considered, who here rose superior in practice to what even the most enlightened sages had reached in theory; though Menander says: oüros кpd'-

 doubt but that the Jeus, as well as the Roman soldiers, were included in this prayer, which can only be supposed to import an intercession that opportunity for repentance may be granted to the guilty, and that pardon may be extended to such as should lay hold on the forbearance of God. That not a few did so, is clear from the Evangelical history contained in the Acts of the Apostles.
40. oùठる $\phi \circ \beta \hat{y} \sigma^{\circ} \tau \delta \nu$ Өedv, öтt \&c.] The best Commentators are agreed that the ouve must be joined with $\sigma \dot{v}$. Bornem. well expresses the sense as follows: "Ne te quidem vereri Deum, eo magis miror quod pari es in supplicio."
41. $\dot{\alpha}$ тотоע ${ }^{\text {j }}$ The word denotes what has no place, is naught, and therefore may well signify what is naughty or evil.
 on Lysias i. 572 ., Reiske, and Ǩuin. think the sense is : quando redieris in regno tuo, i.e. Rex, regia potestate preditus. But though that sense
 does not obtain in the Scriptures; and altogether the above interpretation is a strained one; so that there is no reason to abandon the common opi-
入eiav, especially since this idiom is common in the later Greek writers.
43. бrínepon-rapad.] There has been much discussion both among antient and modern Commentators as to what Christ intended the penitent malefactor to understand by the "paradise" promised. Chrys., Euthym., Grot., Wets., and many of the best recent Commentators, are agreed that he could not mean to countenance Jewish fables, or the notions of the Essenes, or the Pharisaical ones (like the Mahometan) of a paradis of sensual delights. Nor must we suppose that by Paradise is meant heaven. The word is commonly supposed to be derived from the Persian Dפר, a garden-but, in fact, as Schroeder Pref. Thes. Ling. Armen. p. 36. (referred to by Bornem.) has shown, from the Armenian. Now as great pains were bestowed by the Orientals on their gardens, the word easily came to mean, as we say, a pleasure-garden, place of luxury and enjoyment. In this sense rapadetioos often occurs in Xenophon. Hence it is no wonder that the term came to denote, among the later Jews, the Hades, that pleasant abode appointed for the reception of the pious dead, until they should, after the day of judgment, be again united to their bodies in a future state. See Joseph. Bell. Jud. iii. 8, 4. \& ii. 8, 11. This, Chrysost. has shown, was the idea entertained of Paradise by all the Orthodor believers of his time. The sense, therefore, meant to be expressed was, that the penitent malefactor might hope from the mercy of God for blessings far beyond the imagination of the Jewish Doctors, even a secure and quiet retreat for the time which should intervene between death and the resurrection; and also (which was implied in the other)' an admittance into the regions of that eternal felicity of which the other was but a foretaste and earnest.
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 xxvii. 54. by which a method of removing the minute discrepancy between the accounts of the Evangelists will suggest itself. One may observe, how peculiarly suitable $\delta \nu \tau w s$ is to this passage of Luke, and $d \lambda \eta \theta \omega$ is to those of Matthew and Mark: in the first of which the sense is, "This was truly [what he appeared to be] a just person;" in the 2 d and 3 d ," This was really the personage he claimed to be-the Son of God." On the distinction between $\tilde{o}^{2} \nu T \infty=0$ and $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta \omega$ sis see Titty. de Synom. p. 162.
 nifies properly to lay down together, and, in the middle voice, to range oneself with any others, to act with them. So that we need not, with most philologists, suppose an clip. of $\psi \dot{\eta} \phi o \nu$. The term is used in this sense both in the LXX. and the Classical writers.
 also anxiously looked forward to the kingdom which God should establish by the Messiah.
54. '̇тéфผoкe] 'was just dawning,' just
drawing on, commencing. As the Sabbath commenced in the evening of the preceding day, the expression ééqшoкe requires to be taken by a metaphor which may seem strange. The difficulty has been fully and ably considered by Campo. and an elaborate explication of this idiom is offered by Michaelis in his Introd. i. 139. seqq., who accounts it a Syriasm. But that has been completely set aside by Bp. Marsh. Kuin. adopts the explication of Wets., who justly observes, that however incongruous it might sound to Greek and Roman ears, when they heard of the evening or approach of night expressed by
 and by no means harsh. After all, Camps. accounts for it the most satisfactorily by attributing it to the confusion of Oriental with Classical ideas and phrases, so likely to occur in a Jew by no means slightly tinctured with Classical erudition.
XXIV. 1. o o $\rho$ Oo vv $\beta a \theta$ cos $]$ Ba aus is often used with words denoting time, especially evening. night, or the dawn of day. On the true sense of $\delta_{\rho \theta} \boldsymbol{\rho o s}$ see my note on Thucyd. iii. 112.
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5．к久เขovō̄̀ $\tau \delta$ т $\rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi o \nu]$ By way of re－ verence，not adoration．See Doddr．and Wets． in Recens．Synop．
 speech for＇why seek ye a living person in a sepulchre，＇
 （cited by Wets．）aта тє́ф！̣иє．Xen．Anab．vii．7，24．入̄̄pos тávтa cióкєя cival．I have in Recens．Synop．shown that $\lambda \bar{\eta} p o s i s$ derived from the Ang．Sax．Leeren， as tale from Tellen，and both mean（something） told；and 2 dly ，a mere tale，or old saw．

12．таракú廿ая］Паракúттсєข properly sig－ nifies to stoop to any thing，and especially to stoop to look at any thing，and is usually said of those who look out of a window，or survey any thing attentively．This last is the sense in the present passage．The notion of looking at is， however，not inherent in the word，a sense of which I have found an example in Theocr．Id．

－$\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \pi \rho \partial s \dot{\epsilon} \alpha u \tau \dot{\partial} \nu, \theta a v \mu$ ．］There has been a doubt raised as to the construction．Some Commentators take т $\rho o s \dot{\epsilon}$ ．with $\dot{\alpha} \pi \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon$ ，and render the clause，＇He departed wondering within himself at the event．＇They compare $\delta \iota \in \lambda o \gamma i$－ そovтo т $\rho \delta$ s éavtóvs at Luke xx．14．and $\pi \rho o-$
 take $\pi \rho \delta{ }^{2}$ e．with $\theta a v \mu$ ．and appeal to Joh．
 some Classical passages．But these will only prove that such might be the sense，if the contert would permit it；whereas that is in favour of the former mode，which is confirmed by the antient Commentators，Translators，and Interpreters．

13．ס̇́o $\epsilon \xi$ aúr $\omega \nu$ ］These words must be re－ ferred to ver． 9 ．，where we read $\dot{\alpha} \pi \eta^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \in \Lambda \lambda a y$
 rois．The two persons here mentioned are，with reason，supposed to have been of the number of the A postles，or Seventy disciples．The name of one of these persons the Evangelist has recorded； that of the other he has omitted to mention，and has thereby exercised the ingenuity of the Com－ mentators，some of whom conjecture Nathanael， others Bartholomew，or Luke himself，or even Peter，which is least of all probable．
－＇E ${ }^{\prime} \mu \mu{ }^{\prime}$ ós］There were two places of this name；one a city or toun， 160 stadia from Je－ rusalem，and often mentioned in Josephus，the Books of Maccabees，and the Rabbinical writings； the other（the one here meant）a village distant only 70 stadia．Grot．thinks these persons lived at Emmaus，and were returning thither from the feast of the Passover．
14．$\omega \mu$ i $\lambda o u \nu \pi \rho d s d \lambda \lambda \eta$＇$\lambda$ ．］＇wwere conversing with each other：＇This signification of $\omega^{\prime} \mu$ ．is rare in the Classical writers，but not unfrequent in the Hellenistic ones．
 agreed among the Commentators whether this being held，or hindered proceeded from natural causes，or supernatural ones．The antients and early moderns take the latter view，and attempt， but unsuccessfully，to trace the mode in which this was effected；though they adduce several passages of the Classical writers where a similar effect is ascribed to the influence of some Deity，
 дєठорко́та．The more recent Commentators ascribe it to natural causes，taking the word me－












taphorically; and refer the hindrance to the inattention of the observers, or to our Lord's being so situated as not to be distinctly seen, as also to the change of apparel mentioned at Mark xvi. 12. In this view it may be considered as an Oriental and popular mode of expression, importing that they were prevented from recognising, i. e. failed to recognise him. But the
 just after, seems to be too strong a term to permit us to suppose aught less than Divine agency on either the body, or the mind, or both. Though as there is a marked aconomy in all the preternatural agencies of the Deity, the above natural causes might have their effect.
17. $\left.\alpha^{\prime} \nu \tau \downarrow \beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon\right]$ The word properly signifies ' to toss backwards and forwards,' as a ball; but is here (as in an idiom of our own language) used of the reciprocation or interchange of remark in conversing or arguing. So 2 Macc. xi. 3. т $\rho$ ds $\dot{\text { éautio }} \dot{\alpha}$ d., reason with himself. At кal
 why, taken from the preceding rives.
 some difference of opinion as to the exact import of these words. The antient and earlier modern Commentators take the sense to be: 'Art thou the only sojourner (or, as others render, 'the only resident') in Jerusalem, who art ignorant of these things? But the best Commentators from. Whitby and Wolf downwards take rapotкeì here in the sense of being a stranger, and regard the words as a form of speech applied to those who are ignorant of what is doing around them. And they render: 'Art thou alone such a stranger in Jerusalem as to be unacquainted with these circumstances?' For illustration, Wets. and Kypke adduce several passages of the Classical writers, as Dio Or. iii. p. 42 . бù ápa póvos
 rather chuse to take $\mu$ óvos for $\mu$ óvov, and take жароикөis for жápoıкоs ets, rendering,' Art thou but a stranger in Jerusalem, and art ignorant of these things? i.e. Art thou, though but a stranger in Jerusalem, ignorant,' \&c. The $\varepsilon \nu$ is omitted in most of the antient MSS. and in the Ed. Pr. and other early Edd., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Bengel and Wets. to Scholz; but perhaps without cause; for as there is no example of this signification in the N.T. or the LXX., but many in the best Classical writers,
the $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ would seem to have been suppressed by those antient Critics, who made it their business everywhere to polish the style of the N.T.
 some imagine, redundant; nor is it, as others suppose, emphatic, and intended as a title of honour, but is merely a vestige of the verbosity of primitive times, when what are now verbal nouns, were then esteemed as adjectives, and consequently required àvip or some other noun to make them serve for substantives. Thus the idiom is most found in the earliest writers, as Homer, Herodot., and Thucyd.
 perly signifies ' having pouer;' but sometimes, efficacy or authority and influence, and here (as also at Acts vii. 22.) both power and skill, or excellence. So Thucyd. i. 139. 入є́रetv тє кal $\pi \rho \alpha \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \iota$ ס̀vaтต́тaтos. which embraces, according to Homer, all the virtues of a perfect man. Here épyce relates to the miracles; and入ó ${ }^{2} \varphi$ to the Dirine visdom of our Lord.
20. $\partial \boldsymbol{\partial} \pi \cos \tau e$ J Bornem. well remarks that öncos $\tau e$ refers to the oúk ${ }^{\text {en }} \gamma \nu$ vos at v. 18.
21. $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \pi \bar{\alpha} \sigma t$ ] The $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu$ is for $\dot{e} \pi i$, as often in the Scriptural and Classical writers, like oy for על in Hebrew. But the idiom may most exactly be paralleled by our adverb withal, which was once a phrase, i.e. "with all this," or these things. Thus $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \pi a \sigma$ occurs, in this very sense in Dionys. Hal. i. 59. 'A $\lambda \lambda \lambda{ }^{\alpha} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}$, just before, is noted by Bornem. as a very rare formula, and to be rendered, at nimirum, or at sane.
 anomalous in this phraseology, which has perplexed the Commentators. Some think there is a Nominative (as $\theta \epsilon \delta s$, oùpavds, or ${ }^{\eta} \lambda$ icos ) understood. Others suppose ä $\gamma \in t$ put for $\boldsymbol{a} \gamma$ erat, taken impersonally. Others, again, take orísepov as a Nomin. But all these methods are more or less objectionable. There is the least difficulty involved in the method pursued by Beza, Kypke, Middl., and others, who supply 'I $\boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma o u ̈ s$, by an idiom frequent in the best writers, whereby, when it is intended to show that a thing has been done on a certain day, they ascribe what denotes the day to the person. Examples are, indeed, said by Kuin. to be wanting. But examples of the phrase $\boldsymbol{d} \gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\rho} \rho a \nu$ (like the Latin agere diem) are adduced by Wets., and of the idiom in question by the other Com-
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mentators；and it would be unreasonable to demand examples of the two comjoined．

22．d $\xi \in \sigma \sigma \eta \sigma \alpha \nu]$＇have thrown us into amaze－ ment．＇This active sense is also found in Acts viii．9．There is an ellipsis of тoū voū．＂Op日pıat is adject．for adverb，as often，especially in ad－ jectives of time，both in Greek and Latin．
24．Tīv $\left.\sigma \dot{v} \nu \eta^{\eta} \mu i v\right]$ Sub．óyт $\omega \nu$ ；a frequent ellip．
25．dvoทंтot ］Doddr．and Campb．object to the Eng．Vers．＇fools，＇and render thoughtless．And indeed that àójros and similar terms，as $\mu$ copds and $\mu \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\tau} \alpha \cos ^{\text {a }}$ are often in Greek and in all lan－ guages used in a milder sense is certain．And as the term in the original is an adjective，so an adjective should be used in the translation．If foolish be thought too harsh，we may render mis－ judging．The word，indeed，denotes either one who has not，or who uses not the faculty of reason， （the עoūv）or uses it not aright．Tittm．also，de Synon．p．59．in the course of a learned discus－ sion of the difference between é $\lambda_{\kappa v \in \iota \nu}$ and $\sigma \dot{p} \rho e \iota \nu$ ， truly remarks：＂Nam uti sappius è $\lambda \kappa \in \iota \nu$ de iis dicitur，qui sermone aliisve artibus alios pellici－ rent，ut morem sibi gerant；ita etiam in illis locis nihil aliud est，quam allicere，adducere，ad partes suas perducere，quod non violentia fit，qua plerumque in trahendo，（ $\dot{v} \nu \tau \hat{\omega}$ óópecv）sed dum quavis ratione voluntas flectitur．＂As to кal Bpadeìs т $\hat{\eta}$ карdía，$\beta$ padus is often opposed to $\alpha \gamma \times i \nu o u s$, reudy witted，and is preserved in the Latin bardus， from the Æolic $\beta$ apoús．But as here тị кapoía is added，it cannot denote stupid，but rather sluggishly disposed，indisposed；and roù xıन－ teverv is for als rd mıorevech．So James i．19．

27．$\alpha \rho \xi \alpha \dot{\mu} \mu v o s ~ \dot{a} d$ M．］Even in the Books of Moses there are prophecies，as，for instance， those respecting Esau and Dan，\＆cc．There are also types and symbols，as of the serpent erected
by Moses；and also some connected with the affairs of David，the explanation of which Christ delivered to the Apostles，and the Apostles to us． It seems probable，too，that a similar mystical explication of other prophecies was delivered by Christ，or by the Holy Spirit，and handed down by tradition in the Church；as of the affairs of Isaac．（Grot．）
 ciovac signifies properly＇to take to oneself， make one＇s own；and，in a metaphorical sense， to make us though ；＇a sense occurring both in the Scriptural（as 1 Sam．xxi．41． 2 Sam．xiii．5．） and the Classical writers．See Note on Mark vi．48．Euthym．well explains it $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \eta \mu a \tau i \zeta$ ето， ＇he made a motion as though．＇At all events． there is no ground for founding any charge of dissimulation against our Lord；for he would really have gone on，had he not been detained by their friendly importunity，which is all that ra－ peßtaбavto imports．On which idiom see Note on Matt．xiv．22．and Mark xiv．23．Bornem． renders ropєúє 0 at by proficiscendum esse，since тробтоteîotat includes a sense of will and obli－ gation．
 with nouns of time denotes the proximity of it， （answering to our towards）．And he then cites



30．к入ब́ซas a．］This was contrary to the cus－ tom of guests；that office belonging to the enter－ tainer（as we find from Xenoph．，Hom．，and Apuleius，）except when the host，out of respect， chose to resign it to the guest．（Grot．\＆Pric．）

31．סinvoix $\theta^{\prime \prime} \sigma a \nu$ of $\left.\delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu o l\right]$ On the hin－ drance before adverted to being removed，and on a nearer approach，they recognised Christ．See Note supra ver． 16.
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- ápaytos $\dot{\text { énéneto d. a.] There has been }}$ come difference of opinion as to the exact sense of these words. The best Commentators are, however, agreed that áqavios é $\gamma \dot{\text { éveco }} \mathrm{d}_{\text {. }} a_{i}$ must be equivalent to $\eta$ фaviof $\eta \dot{\alpha} \pi^{\prime}$ aúràn ; and that we are not to suppose that our Lond vanished as a spectre might be imagined to do. Grot., who discusses the mode of our Lord's disappearance, confesses that of the three ways in which it may have happened, two are easier of comprehension, but the third not impossible. And he thinks it better, with Basil, not to scrutinize the hows. A prudence certainly much to be commended, but which here may be thought not quite in place, since from the passages of the Classical writers adduced by Abresch and Wets. (see also Recens. Synop.) none can doubt but that the sense simply is,' 'he suddenly or abruptly withdrew from their company.' See more in my Note on Thucyd. viii. 38. גтот $\lambda_{\text {écev }}$ -dфavîcrat. In all the passages adduced there and in Recens. Syn. all that is implied by this use of dфavi\}sc日ai or the synonymous expressions áфavtor yivectac \&c. is a notion of suddenness or abruptness in the action of the verb.

32. кароіа ท $\mu$ мі̀ касоде́vn] Kypke observes that кaieotat is often used of the more violent emotions, especially joy, (of which see my exapples in Recens. Synop.) and truly remarks, that the affection here meant was a compound feeling, made up partly of respectful affection towards one who had so ably expounded the oracles of the Prophets; of desire to longer enjoy his society and instruction ; of joy, since they anxiously longed that what he had taught them of the resurrection of the Messiah should prove true, and (though with some fluctuation of mind) rejoiced in the anticipation of that truth.

 mévas, from which words many have inferred
that Jesus entered the closed doors without stirring them on their hinges. But then it would have been written $\delta \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ $\theta \nu \rho \bar{\omega} \nu \kappa \kappa \kappa \lambda \epsilon \tau \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$. Indeed, the last words have solely a reference to
 (say some) has not John noted that the doors were opened ! True; but such minutia as this ( namely, whether Jesus himself opened the door, or ordered it to be opened) the Evangelists are not accustomed to touch on. Besides, had the disciples from Emmaus also entered by the closed doors! The word $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma T \eta$ [which is for $\dot{\text { en tarn }}$ ] indicates that Jesus appeared suddenly and unexpectedly. (Kin.)
33. ттon $\theta$ av es] This term and $\epsilon \mu \phi о \beta$ os are synonymous, but joined for emphasis. On Jewish notions of spirits see Recens. Synop. It may be added that our Lord meant not to countenance those notions, but to show his hearers that, according to their own notions of spirits, he could not be one.
34. dıa入oyเซцol divaßaivovot] Of this use of dvaßaives and the Latin surgere examples are adduced by Wets., which show that it is not (as Schleus. says) a Hebraism. The idiom, indeed, is found in all languages.
35. туєйда—оі́к er $\chi \in 1$ ] This was spoken according to the usual opinion of all nations. See the Note of Grot. and the numerous Classical citations adduced by Wets., many of which (together with others of my own) may be seen in Recess. Synop. Dr. Burton, Brampton Lect. p. 166., thinks that in this passage Luke intended to remove the fancies of the Doceta. A notion, however, too fanciful. Like Hammond, the learned Professor is too apt to seek the G nostics, or other heretics, on very slight grounds, or none at all. He, however, truly observes, that the doubts of the Apostles were very ifferent from those of the Docetæ. The disciples hesitated whether the person they saw was the same who had been crucified; but they never doubted his having had a real body.
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36. $\alpha$ สเбтоúvт founded in nature. The disciples yet doubted; as is sometimes the case on the occurrence of events very felicitous, and which happen suddenly and unexpectedly. We think this news too good to be believed, and fancy we are dreaming.
37. $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi \boldsymbol{j} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \iota \sigma \sigma$ iov кทpiou] A frequent food with the antients, especially those who affected abstemiousness of diet.
 The sense is, 'The words uttered by me, when I was with you, imported that all things written of me (my death, burial, and resurrection) should be fulfilled.' The Psalms are mentioned for the Hagiographia, as being the chief book of that division of the $O$. T.
38. $\delta \iota \eta \eta^{2} \omega \iota \xi \in \nu a . \tau \delta \nu \nu$.]. This is very distinct in sense from the explanation of the Scriptures mentioned supra ver. 27., and imports an enlightening of the mind by assisting the natural powers; and it may include inclining and disposing the mind to attend to the knowledge in

 II. And Plut., cited by Wets., says of the reading of the Poets: тробауoryei кal т $\rho о \sigma \kappa \lambda i \nu \in i$

39. кal кฑрux $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\eta \nu \alpha \iota, ~ \& c c .] ~ S u p p l y ~}^{\delta \in i}$ from the ésec foregoing.
 neuter, are sometimes (as here) put impersonally in the neuter gender. The Accus. is put instead of a Genit. of consequence. Thus the sense is, 'the beginning being made.' è $\pi \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \in s$
 mencement should be made from Jerusalem was
according to a sort of antient prerogative of the Holy city.
40. Toúcos ] Namely, (says Whitby) of the events of the life, death, and especially resurrection of Christ, as an unequivocal proof of his Divine mission.
41. drayre $i a \nu]$ i. e. the thing promised, namely, the gift of the Holy Spirit. ' $\mathrm{E} \xi$ 并 $\psi o u s$, i. e. dॄ oupavoù, which sense confirms H . Tooke's derivation of heaven, as participle past of heafan to heave, raise. So the Greek oupayds comes from onpo, to raise.

- \&vס́v́ $\eta \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ] Evסíecoat answers to the Hebr. לבש and the Latin induere; but, like them, is both in the Classical and Scriptural writers used in the sense to be endued; i.e. completely furnished with any power, for though $\pi \in \rho \iota \beta \alpha \lambda$ $\lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ and $\varepsilon \nu \dot{o} v v_{c} \theta a l$ be used promiscuously in the N. T., yet properly, the former signifies to cast a robe about one, the latter to be involved in a coat or some article of dress, which implies the fully clothing the part or whole of the body to which the article is meant. On this omission of $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ with the Conjunction, and on the force in general when expressed, see the masterly Dissertation by Hermann. subjoined to the new edition of Steph. Thes.

50. ЄErizaye kw.] That there is here no pleonasm, (as Kuin. fancied), has been shown by Bornem., who adduces several examples from the Classics.
 must denote the performance of religious worship, now first rendered to Christ by the Apostles, and paid to him even though absent and invisible; a decisive proof of the opinion they entertained of his Divinity.

# TO KATA I $\boldsymbol{\Omega}$ ANNHN 

EYAГГEMION.





C. I. 1. \& seqq. On this golden Proem, see an erudite Dissertation of $C$. Vitringa, T. ii. p. 122-156. Bulli Opera, p. 164. 178. Also on the whole of this Gospel, Bp. Blomfield's Lectures.
 sion answers to the Hebr. בראשית, in Gen. i. 1. which the Evangelist seems to have had in mind. On account of the $\bar{\eta} \nu$ many Commentators explain the phrase to mean before the creation of the world, referring for examples of this sense of ${ }^{d} \nu \alpha \alpha^{\alpha} \rho x \hat{n}$ to Joh. xvii. 5. Eph. i. 4. and Prov. viii. 23 , where it is more exactly defined by the preceding $\pi \rho \delta$ toü alcuyos, and the following $\pi \rho d$
 sages, nor in the one before us, has iv properly this senee, nor can it ever have it. It is only implied from the context. For what was existing at the creation of the world must have existed before it.
 limits of a work of this nature to do any sort of justice to the important, but controverted, subject of the Logos. I must therefore content myself with referring my readers to the matter given in Recens. Synop., also to Townsend N. T. Chron. p. 7. seqg. and Dr. Burton's Bampton lectures, p. 212-24., in whose view 1 must acquiesce. Whatever may be the source from whence St. John borrowed this term, all the best informed inquirers are agreed, contrary to the Unitarians, that it designates a real subsisting being, and not an attribute, as Wisdom, or Reason. Indeed the personality of the Logos is manifest from the whole of the Proem.

The summary by Vitringa of the substance of the sense contained in this Proem, and the Gnostical heresies which each clause may be supposed to encounter, is a valuable key to the whole ; which see ap. Townsend. Dr. Burton sums up the substance of what the Evangelist may be supposed to have intended to teach his converts, as follows: "You have all learnt to speak of Jesus Christ as the Word of God; but beware lest that term should lead you to false and impious notions concerning him : remember that Jesus Christ our Logos has a real and substantial existence : he is not merely the mind of God, still less is be like a word, put forth from
the mouth, which vanishes away: our Logos existed always with God; he is God, and the only begotten Son of God: it was he who created all things; and in these latter times it was he who came down from heaven, was made flesh and dwelt among us, even Jesus, who is the Christ, the Son of God."
 'and the Logos was God.' 'O גóyos may be the subject, and $\theta \in \dot{\delta}$ s the predicate, as in Joh. iv. 24. тиєйда $\dot{\dot{c}}$ Өєóт. The temerity of Crellius, who, to destroy this irrefragable testimony to the Godhead of Jesus Christ, would alter $\Theta$ eds to $Ө$ eoū, met with well merited chastisement from Bengel and Wets. Some later Socinians have attempted to compass the same end by maintaining that as $\theta$ eds has not the Article, it should be taken in a lower sense, to denote a God. But that has been utterly refuted by Beng., Campb., Middlet., and Kuin. Bengel compares 1 Kings rviii. 24. (Sept.) oüros $\theta$ cós. And Middlet. has proved that in the present construction the Article could not have been used without communicating a position as little accordant with the Socinian as with the Trinitarian hypothesis.
2. $\pi \rho \delta_{s} \tau d \nu \theta$ ©óv] The phrase cival $\pi \rho \partial_{g} \tau d \nu$ $\theta$ eoj denotes close union and intimate society. See Joh. rvii. 5.

- тd́vтa-jéverol By mávтa is meant all things in the woold, the universe. 'Eyévero is for ктífectat, as the usus loquendi permits, and the context requires. See Ps. cxlviii. 33. Many Commentators take $\delta$ ra as denoting the instrumental cause, as in Hebr. i. 2. But there is no reason to abandon the opinion of almost all the antient and the most eminent modern Interpreters, that it denotes the efficient and principal cause, as in Rom. xi. 36. Gal. i. 1. and often elsewhere. Besides, the passage of Hebrews is of quite a different nature to this of St. John; since in the latter only one agent is spoken of, but in the other two agents are adverted to. Thus the Logos is described as the true God and supreme Creator of the universe, who, on account of his communion with the Divine nature, hath an equal power with the Father, and by his cooperation with the Father, created the word.
The next wordis kal x mpis- - ydrovey are uavally
 каі $\dot{\eta}$ бкотіа aúтò où катé入аßev.
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explained as yielding the same sentiment with the foregoing clause; the same thing being expressed both by affirmation and by negation, of which see many examples in Recens. Synop. But here we have not the same thing expressed; but a much stronger sentiment. Even the dialysis oudd ay has an intensive force.

4. "To the physical creation by the Logos is here subjoined (says Lightf.) a new and moral creation." ' $\mathbf{E} \nu, 3$, by. Zuri. On the exact force of this word here the Commentators are not agreed; and it is difficult to fix it, there being many senses in which it will be true, that Christ was 乡wri. The physical sense is (in vain) supported by some, while most explain it 'felicity ;' and that signification is frequent in the N.T. The sense, however, should rather seem to be, 'the cause of felicity,' implying the power of
 кal in $\zeta$ omi. And Col. iii. 4. Compare also vi. 33, 35, 51. xvii. 2. Yet for felicity I would substitute 'salvation,' i.e. the means of attaining it. When this is said just after to be the "light of men," that must be because the means of attaining salvation are considered in the light of a system, viz. the religion Christ came to disseminate. Thus $\eta$ Genin seems to signify the method of salvation by that religion. That might well be said to be "the light of men," as being the means of enlightening, and, by an easy transition, of blessing and saving men. That light and life are accustomed to be conjoined or interchanged, is fully proved by the Classical citations of Wets. and the other Philological illustrators, in which the Gods and heroes are represented as the light and life of men. See Recens. Synop. Wetr. has ably illustrated the force of ev here, which is very significant. He proves that the $\dot{z} \nu$ denotes that the power was centered in, i.e. elf-derived; not as was the case with the Prophets. "In Christ (he adds) were reposed all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, and his power was exerted by a proper and natural, not an adventitious, acquired, or delegated force. Thus he is

5. кal тd фw̄s-où кат $\lambda a \beta e v]$ Most Commentators take $\mathrm{T}^{2}$ фês to here mean the author of light. But it should rather seem to denote the method of enlightening and blessing men, i.e. the light of the Gospel. Eкотía is a perpetual image of ignorance, and the misery consequent upen it. See Is. ix. 1. Matth. iv. 16. Acts xxvi. 18., and also the Classical citations in Recens. Synop. Here, however, it is put (abstract for concrete) in the place of rois toxotıfuévoıs тד̣̆ dıavoia, Eph. iv. 18. \$aivet is Pres. for Aorist. As to кaré $\lambda a \beta e$, the best modern Commentators explain it could not penetrate,' or dispel, 'it.' Thus, casting aside the figure, the sense (they say) is, the ignorant
world would not admit the great teacher.' And Wets. has a most beautiful illustration of the sense founded on this view, to which I have, in Recens. Synop., subjoined a very apposite one from Max. Tyr. Diss. xl. and now add Pind. Olymp. i. 3. If, however, фws just before, have the sense which I have assigned to it, the same must have place here, and I would render ov катé $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}$ comprehended not the doctrines of Christ, or the Religion he came to promulgate.
6-8. The scope of these verses (which are in some measure parenthetical) is to show the purpose of God in sending John, and to prove, even on the evidence of John himself, the infinite superiority of Christ to John, q.d. to bear witness to this light, and further its reception, was John sent from God, not as being himself the author of that light, but to bear witness to the Divine mission of Him who was so. Aúrẹ is for $\psi$, by an idiom not confined to the Hebrew, but extending to the popular dialect of every language.
7 els $\left.\mu a \rho \tau v \rho i \alpha \nu, I_{\nu \alpha} \mu a \rho \tau.\right]$ Here there is not so much a repetition of the same thing in plainer terms ; but tua $\mu \alpha \rho \tau . \& c$. is an epanorthosis upon els maptupiay tou фwтós. In fact, the tautologies, repetitions, pleonasms, and positions expressed both negatively and affirmatively in which this Gospel is said by the Commentators to abound, may almost all of them be accounted for on that principle, which itself arose from anxiety on the part of the Evangelist to impress the important truths he had to communicate as forcibly as possible on the minds of his readers. In this view, the $\phi$ wis of the following verse signifies, by metonymy, the author or dispenser of light, (i.e. true religion), namely, Christ, as often in this Gospel, and in Matth. v. 14. Lu. ii. 32. (where see Notes) and elsewhere. Hıб-
 designated by the term фо̂s, i. e. Christ.
6. excinvos] This should be expressed by 'he himself.'
 light,' i.e. he was the true light. Of this use of $d \lambda \eta \theta$. with $\phi$ wos examples are adduced by Wets. In the sense of reality there is implied excellence, as in Joh. vi. 32. xv. 1. iv. 29. and elsewhere. $\Phi_{\text {cori } i\} e s}$ is taken by the best Interpreters, antient and modern, as put for the Future фwo ifet, or to be taken to mean 'who was to enlighten.' But it may rather be said to have the sense of the Aorist, and to denote what is done at all times; or at least it should be rendered 'who is
 (as the best Commentators are agreed) ' men of all nations,' and not the Jews only; which is meant to contravene the Jewish notion, that the Messiah was to come for the salvation of the Jer: only.



 is $\%$,


 monly taken (as would seem more natural) with т $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \pi \nu$. But the best Commentators are agreed that they should be construed with $\tau \delta$ dwis. For in the former case the words would seem unnecessary, and never occur in that sense; whereas in the latter, the phrase is very significant, and applicable to Christ. Compare
 Nóo $\mu$ ò was a usual phrase to designate the Mesiah. See vi. 14. xviii. 37. Not to say that that sense would require the Article. It should seem from the context that the latter interpretation is the preferable one; but the arguments founded on the want of the Article, and the non-occurrence of the phrase in the sense to be born, are of no great weight ; the former, from the inartificial character of St. John's style; and the latter, because it occurs in the Rabbinical uriters, and is perpetually found in the popular phraseology of all nations and ages.
7. $\dot{\delta} \nu \tau \bar{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \varphi \dot{\eta} \nu]$ It is strange that the Commentators should have disagreed on the sense of this verse, in which the terms кóaros and $\dot{\text { écénecto must be taken, not in a moral, but }}$
 designate the appearance and existence of the Logos on earth in a human form. It is well observed by Tittm., that in this and the following verse ascendit oratio, q.d. The only and true Saviour came to, and abode in the world, a world created by him, but which nevertheless knew him not, acknowledged him not as such. Nay, though he came to his own people especially, yet even they received him not as the Saviour. Some take $\tau \dot{a}$ iòia to mean the uorld at large. But though it be true, that the whole earth is the Lord's, yet Christ would not be rejected by those to whom he did not reveal himself as Saviour, viz. the Gentiles. Indeed, he professes (Matth. $\mathbf{x v}$. 24.) that he was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. The best Commentators are therefore, with reason, agreed that $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ idea can only mean his own country, or people; a sense of which numerous examples are adduced by Krebs, Wets., and Kypke. The Jews were the peculiar people of God, and consequently of Christ as united in the Godhead. Besides, the Jews might be called Christ's own people, as being born and living among them. Oi iotoc signifies his countrymen in general. And what is asserted of these was true even of most of his nearest relatives.
 completed thus. "His countrymen as a body rejected him. Yet his coming was not utterly without effect. Some few did acknowledge him as Mexsiah. And to such as did, or liereafter
should, he gave, \&c." 'REovoia here denotes privilege, prerogative; a signification sometimes occurring in the later Classical writers and the LXX. By $\tau$ éкva $\theta$ eoù is meant obedient and faithful urorshippers of God, and, from the adjunct, those who are received and acknowledged by God as such, and admitted to the privilege of Sonship. The phrase often occurs in the discourses of our Lord, and in the Epistles of Sc. Paul and St. John, and is traced by Tittm., as the fundus locutionis, to Deut. xiv. $1 \& 2$. Td övoцa aùтoù. By Hebraism, for aùтóv.
 down by the best Commentators is: 'Who obtained that Sonship, (ivooeria), not by virtue of ancestry, nor by any affinity, or connexion of human descent, but by a free grant from God.' The plural is used with accommodation to Eठoкe $\nu$ before; but, of course, what is applied to those who received Jesus as Messiah during his abode on earth, is equally applicable to those who should, after his ascension, at any future period receive him as Messiah, and embrace his religion. The plural aindंтcuy has reference to the several celebrated ancestors from whom the children of Israel boasted their descent, as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. See 2 Cor. xi. 22. sq. I have, in Recens. Synop. compared as an example

 erroneously explained by Dr. Hales to mean, 'from natural instinct,' or from the moral principle of reason or conscience; whereas the two phrases, by Hendiadys, only designate per euphemismum the natural mode of descent, as opposed to the spiritual one, proceeding from the adoption of God.
8. каl $\dot{\delta}$ 入óyos $\sigma \grave{\alpha} \rho \xi \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma$.] This is closely
 a resumption of what was there said. Render: "And [so] the Logos was clothed with a human thody, and sojourDed among us [men].' Sap eyévero, 'assumed a human body.'. This frequent sense of $\sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \xi$ is of Hebrew origin. ${ }^{\text {sap }}$ ktveds $\epsilon$. would have been more Classical Greek. So Artemid. ii. 35. éáy $\tau \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \sigma \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa t v o t ~ o i l ~ \theta \epsilon o l$ фаишшутat, \&c. This addition of the human nature to the Divine, implies that conjunction by which the same person is Son of God, and Son of man.

- taxivuoce] There is no necessity to suppose, with Lampe and Schoetg., any reference to the Schechinah. The sense is what Wets. lays down: 'He who had dwelt in Heaven descended from thence, that he might sojourn with men.' For, as 1 have proved and illustrated by examples in Recens. Synop., owypoù s 'to take up one's quarters, or sojourn.
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is used in preference to $\zeta$ ĝ̣̀ with allusion to the life of man as a sojourn. The sense is, that "Jesus became a real man, and lived as such." 'Eөєаба́леөa. The sense is, 'we actually and really saw.'

14. סógav cos $\mu$ ovoyevoüs $\pi$.] ' such a glory as might be expected in a Being the only begotten Son of the Father.' On this subject of the glory of Christ in his mediatorial capacity, see Rose on Parkh. p. 199. b. \& 200. a., and on this and the full sense of $\mu$ óvor., see Tittm. in Recens. Synop. On the construction of the passage, the Commentators are not agreed. Many regard the words каi $: \theta \epsilon a \sigma \alpha \dot{\mu} \epsilon \theta a-\pi a \tau \rho d s$ as parenthetical, referring the $\pi \lambda \dot{\prime} \rho \eta s$ to $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \kappa \dot{\nu} \omega \sigma \sigma \in \nu$. But though this makes the syntax regular, it does violence to the structure of the sentence, and deteriorates the sense. It is better, with others, to suppose an enallage, and regard $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \eta s$ as put for $\pi \lambda$ ijpovs. This is supported by an imitation of the passage adduced by me in Recens. Synop. from Theophyl. Simoc. Xג́pıтos каi $\alpha \lambda$. is thought to be put, per Hendiadyn, for $\chi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \iota \tau n s \alpha \lambda \eta \theta \iota \nu \bar{\eta}$; and the sense of $\pi \lambda \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho \eta s \chi{ }^{d} \rho$. $\kappa a l d \lambda$. to be ' most gracious and benignant.'
15. John having before appealed in a general way to the testimony of the Baptist to Jesus, now proceeds to mention what that testimony was; and when he says it was uttered with a loud voice, he means it was uttered ex animo, and decisively. Kéкрare is well explained by Hesych: Bod.

- $\dot{\delta} \dot{\text { driow- mov }} \dot{\eta} \nu]$ The sense of $\dot{\delta} \dot{\dot{v} \pi i \sigma \omega}$ mov dexópevos seems to be, 'He who enters (i.e. is to enter) upon his office after me,' in which sense the phrase frequently occurs in the N.T., and sometimes in the LXX. Doubtful is
 may be taken either of time, or of dignity. The latter mode of interpretation is adopted by almost all the antient and early modern Interpreters, together with some later Commentators. Lampe lays down the following sense: ' He who cometh after me [as Messiah] is made more honourable than I am, because he was [by his own eternal nature, as God ] more honourable.' The former is adopted by Whitby and almost all the recent Commentators, supported by the Vulg. and other Latin Versions. And they consider the second clause as expressing the same thing with the first. Though Kuin. thinks ört means certainly. Upon the whole, the preference seems to be due to the former interpretation, as yielding a better sense, and not open to any serious objection. For it is in vain that Tittm. denies en $\mu$ poofer ever to be used in the LXX. of priority of rank, since Lampe and Camph. have pulduced ene example from Cien. xlviii. 2 n .

16. каl èк $\tau о$ ô $\left.\pi \lambda \eta \rho \dot{\sigma}^{\prime} \mu a \tau o s-\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \tau o s\right]$ It has been questioned whether these verses are from John the Baptist, or from the Evangelist. The former opinion has been adopted by many Interpreters : but it lies open to the objection, that what is contained in these verses could hardly have been said by John the Baptist of his times, and of his disciples. They are undoubtedly the words of the Evangelist, who, in using the term $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \alpha^{\prime} \mu a \tau o \varsigma ~ s e e m s ~ t o ~ h a v e ~ r e f e r r e d ~ t o ~ t h e ~ e x-~$
 and meant by it to express the abundance of benefits and blessings. It answers to the Hebr. , מלא, which signifies the sum of any thing, and also plenty, multitude, and abundance, as in $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{s}}$. xxiv. 1. See also Eph. iii. 19. Col. i. 19. Eph. i. 23. iv. 10. (Tittm.) This interpretation is also adopted by Lampe and Kuin. 'Eк тoü $\pi \lambda \eta \rho$. a. may be rendered 'from his most rich store-house of benefits and blessings.' How these are in Christ, is evident from the context. See the ample elucidation of the subject by Tittm. in Recens. Synop. The learned are agreed in
 the superlative, like the Hebr. ${ }^{1} 5 \mathrm{y}$, $\boldsymbol{\pi}$, an idiom not unknown to the Greek. Thus Theogn.
 sense is, 'benefits upon benefits,' abundance of benefits. By $\pi$ áv $u \in s$ are meant all Christians of all kinds and stations, of all times and places. Christ, as Tittm. observes, is the fountain of felicity to the whole human race, of every age; an open, perennial, copious and inexhaustible fountain.
 (which were meant for the Jews at large) are exemplified and illustrated the benefits received from Christ by his disciples; and the grace of the Gospel is opposed to the rigour of the Law. The Law was given us a benefit to the Israelites; yet it was harsh and burdensome, and its blessings scanty, and those confined to one nation; whereas the Gospel imparts its blessings through Christ copiously to the whole human race. I
 $\left.a \lambda \eta \theta_{2 \nu}\right)^{\text {, ' the true and most excelleni grace.' }}$
17. Oedv oudels $\dot{6} . \pi$.] This is an illustration of the preceding verse by example, deduced from the clear knowledge of God, communicated by Christ. No wonder that the Gospel of Christ should be so superior to the Law of Moses. No man hath seen (i.e. perfectly known) God, not even Moses and the Prophets. So Eccles. zliii.
 sense of $\dot{\rho} \tilde{\hat{c}} \nu$, corresponding to the Hebr. האר, is found also in the Classical writers. Thus the passage is by no means in contradiction to Exod. xxviii. 11. "the Lord spake to Moses face to
 с' $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\eta \gamma} \boldsymbol{\eta} \sigma a \tau 0$.
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face." Besides, it was Christ, the Logos, who appeared as the Jehovah Angel on that and other occasions.
 these words is by the best Commentators supposed to be, ' He who is most intimately connetted with the Father, and the dearest to Him.' 'This use arose from the custom of all the ancient nations, of reclining at meals; according to which he who sat next the host (who was at the top of the table) seemed, as it were, to lie in his bosom or lap. Hence the phrase is found in the Greek and Latin as well as in the Hebrew wiiter, of which see examples in Recens. Synop. 'EEvүท'бaтo, i. e. has distinctly disclosed his nature, attributes, and will. Wets. thinks there is reference to the $\xi_{\eta \gamma \eta \tau a i}$, or interpreters of the portents, and directors of religious ceremonoes among the Greeks.
18. of 'lovjaio ' ' 'Isp.] ' the Jews of Jerusalem ;' meaning. of course, those who had the authority of making inquiry into the pretensions of prophets, namely, the Sunhedrim. Some think the Evangelist has not given the whole address. A groundless conjecture, however; for the cis in the question evidently refers to the kind of prophetical character claimed by John, which implied, 1. an inquiry whether be was the Christ ; 2. whether he was Elias. The form oi cis it was, it appears from Wetstein's citations, not unusual as addressed by those who demanded to know any one's authority to act in any business. Though the Sanhedrim knew that John's ancestry was not that which had been predicted of Christ; yet when they remembered what had happened to Zacharias in the temple, and that his mother was of the lineage of David, they might think it possible that he was the Messiah; especially as it was not absolutely determined among the doctors whether Christ was to be born at Bethlehem.
 contain the strongest asseveration, since the two methods, assertion by affirmation and by mega-
ton of the contrary, together with a repetition of the affirmation, are here united.
19. Ti oüv] A popular form of expression for fris oùv, yet sometimes found in the best writers. 'H $\boldsymbol{i}$ ias el $\sigma \dot{v}$; the Jews supposed, from Malachi iv. 5., that Elijah would return from Heaven, whither he had been caught up, and would usher in and anoint the Messiah. Oik el $\mu$, i. e. not in the sense in which the question was asked; though in another sense he might be called Elias, as he came in the spirit and power of Elias. See Math. xi. 14.

- $\dot{\dot{s}} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{1}$ not mean Elijah, since that would involve a very vain repetition. The Article shows that it must denote some particular prophet. The best Commentators ancient and modern are of opinion that Jeremiah is meant. Thus the sense will be, 'the prophet promised,' namely, in Deut. xviii. 15-19. See Acts iii. 22.

22. xis ii;] i.e. what sort of person art thou, whether a prophet or not?
23. eq $\gamma \omega$ ф $\phi \nu \eta$ i, \&c.] i.e. as the older Commentators interpret, 'I am the person there spoken of;' or, as the later ones, 'What the Prophet (namely, Isaiah iv. 3.) there says, holds good of me; you will find there what will be a sufficient description of my person and office.'
24. Ti oùv $\beta$ axti!cts, \&c.] The Pharisees (such as these persons were) thought that the right and power of baptizing Jews, and thereby forming a new Religion, was confined to the Messiah and his precursors the Prophets, who, they supposed, would return to life for that parpose.
 swer is : ' 1 only baptize with water, and collect followers for the Messiah, from whom a very different and much more powerful baptism may be expected, even 2 far more effective means of purifying the people. Moreover, he whey require, (i.e. the Messiah) and by where city I do this. is among you.' For th er








 ${ }_{\text {Act. }}^{1.6}$.



 cided testimony, borne by John to Jesus, see Tittm. in Recens. Synop.
25. B $\eta$ $\theta$ avia] This (instead of the common reading $B \eta \theta a \dot{\beta} \dot{\beta} \rho a)$ is found in almost all the most antient MSS., every Version of credit, and many Fathers and antient Commentators. Also almost all the other early editions, and was restored to the text by Wets., Matth., Griesb., Knapp, Vat., Tittm., and Scholy. The best Commentators are of opinion that the common reading proceeded from a mere conjecture of Origen; who, because the situation here does not correspond with that of Bethany, where Lazarus and his sisters lived, made the change in question. There are, however, in all countries many places of the same name, and Bethany, from its signification, (namely, a ferry place or passage), was very likely to be one. Besides, this seems to be distinguished from another Bethany by the addition rípay roū 'Iopdávov.
26. ise $\dot{\delta} \alpha \mu \nu \delta \boldsymbol{L}^{-\kappa \delta o ́ \sigma \mu o v] ~ I n ~ o n d e r ~ t o ~ r i g h t l y ~}$ understand these words, we must observe, 1. that our Lord is called $\delta \dot{\alpha} \mu \nu o \sigma^{\circ}$. Now, as often as in Scripture this name is applied to him, so often the subject of what is spoken is his death and passion, inasmuch as he underwent it for men. And in this view it seems, did John the Baptist consider Jesus, when he called him lamb, namely, as suffering and dying like a victim. It is clear that John meant to represent our Lord as one dying, and that in the place of others. For he has subjoined the words of aipcov tiv duapriav той ко́бщоv, by way of explication. The phrase aipecv riv duaptiay answers to the Hebr. ער אשת or when which never signifies to remove sins, i.e. extirpate iniguity from the earth, (as some recent Interpreters suppose), but to forgive sins, (as in Gen. xviii. 26. 1. 17. Exod. xxxiv. 7. Num. xiv. 19. Ps. xxxii. 1, 5. 1 Sam. xy.25. xxv. 28.) or to pay the penalties of sin, cither one's own, or others; as in Exod. xxviii. 38. Levit. v. 1. xix. 17. xx. 19. Levit. x. 17. where are conjoined, as synonymous, the formulas bear the sin of the pcople, expiate and atone
the people with God. Therefore the formula to bear sins signifies to be punished because of sins, to undergo punishment of sins. Furthermore, to bear one's own sins denotes to be punished for one's own sins, and to bear the sins of others, to be punished for the sins of others, to undergo the punishment which the sins of others have deserved.

Moreover, Christ is said to bear the sin of the whole world; and therefore the interpretation above mentioned can have no place. It must be observed, too, that there is in these formulas a manifest allusion to and comparison with a piacular victim. For a victim of that kind was solemnly brought to the altar, when the Priest put his hands over the head; (which was a symbolical action, signifying that the sins committed by the persons expiated were laid upon the victim; ) and when it was slaughtered, it was then said to bear the sins of the expiated; by which it was denoted that the victim paid the penalty of the sins committed, was punished with death in their place, and for the purpose of freeing them from the penalty of $\sin$. Therefore when Christ is called the lamb bearing the sins of the world, it is manifest that we must understand one who should take upon himself the sins of men, so as to pay the penalties of their sins, and in their place, for the purpose of freeing them from those penalties: and he is described as a sacrifice for the sins of men, or rather, as one who offers such a sacrifice, namely, an expiation. (Tittm.)

30-34. John now mentions how he obtained this knowledge of Jesus to be the Measiah, namely by an express revelation from God. Up to the period of his baptism our Lord (such was his humility of deportment) had passed for a mere man. He was first made known as Messiah by John at his baptism, and through him to the multitude. Whether John had before any knowledge of Jesus by face, is variously disputed. Certain it is that he did not know him to be the Messiah. That knowledge he obtained by a Divine revelation, which gave him the sign by which he should recognise the Messiah. Tbat
 ötı oùtós $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu \dot{o}$ viòs toû $\Theta \in o u ̂$
35























sign he saw in Jesus, and was therefore sure he was that personage.
34. меларт $\quad \rho \eta \kappa \alpha$ ] 'have borne and do bear witness.' This use of the Preter. for the Pres. (Hebraice) is frequent in the N. T.
35. ciorijkct ] 'was standing,' i.e. was there. 'O 'I $\begin{aligned} & \text { adyvis } \text { is omitted in many MSS., Versions, }\end{aligned}$ and Fathers, and is cancelled by Matth., Vat., Tittm., Griesb., and Scholz.
39. T Y Yทreĩe] A popular form of expression signifying, 'What is your wish,' or business with me.

- Toū $\mu$ évets] 'where dwellest thou ?' Md́petv is used either of a fired habitation, or a lodging, as here, and in Lu. xix. 5. xxiv. 29. Acts xviii. 3 \& 20 ., and often in the Sept., and sometimes in the Classical writers. So also masere in the Latin. By calling Jesus $\delta i \delta \dot{\sigma} \sigma x a \lambda e$ they showed that they sought instruction; and by addressing to him the question roû mévecs, private conversation, no doubt, on the great doc: trines which then occupied the minds of all reflecting Jews.

40. \& $\rho$ Xeo $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{e}$ кal 48 .] The most correct view of the force of this address seems to be that taken hy Futhym., who says that our Lord did not tell them where he abore, but bade them follow him, to inspire them with confidence. Of these disciples one, we learn, was Andrew. The other
is supposed to have been the Evangelist himself, who usually suppresses his own name. See xiii. 23. xviit. 15. xix. 26.
— ©pa $\delta \mathrm{d} \boldsymbol{j v}]$ The $\delta \varepsilon$ is omitted in most of the antient MSS. and in the Fdit. Princ. and other early Edd., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Beng. and Wets. to Scholz.

41-43.] On the seeming discrepancy here between the Evangelists, see Recens. Synop.
 the Hebr. 1) 'his brother.' An idiom frequent both in the N. T. and LXX.
44. ' ' 'I noous ] Very many MSS., Versions, and Fathers omit the $\dot{\delta}$ I. here, but insert it after גfץet; and so Griesb., Knapp, Matth., and Scholz edit, perhaps rightly.

- dкo入oúfer $\mu \mathrm{O}$ t A form of speaking equivalent to 'become my disciples,' and sometimes used by the Grecian Philosophers in similar circumstances.

46. Natavari入] supposed to be the same with the Bartholomew mentioned by Matthew, (that being a sirname) because 1. all the rest of John's followers mentioned in the Chapter were received into the number of the Apostles; 2. since John nowhere makes mention of Bentholomew, nor the rest of the Evangelists of Luke, vi, 14., in his likt:
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Bartholomew after Philip, with whom Nathanael was converted.
 $\alpha \gamma a \theta \delta \nu$; It seemed little probable to Nathanael that a good man, much less a prophet, and least of all the Messiah, could come out of Galilee, still less Nazareth, which was but a mean country town, whose inhabitants, like all the Galileans, were held in contempt by the Jews; the cause for which has been attributed to their being a mixed race, partly of Gentile origin, and of very corrupt morals. They were, too, reckoned boorish and stupid, even to a proverb.

- ${ }^{\circ} \rho$ xou каl tode] A formula equivalent to Judge jor yoursulf, Seeing is believing.

48. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \bar{\omega} \bar{s}]$ for $\alpha \lambda \lambda_{\eta} \theta \eta^{\prime} s$. A common permutation. The name true Israelite (denoting one who imitates the virtues of the Patriarch Israel, see Rom. ix.6.) was given among the Jews to persons remarkable for probity. In the words
 reference to what is said of Jacob in Gen. xxv. 27.
49. Nathanael in his answer seems to hint that Jesus had been told of his character by his friends. Now in order to remove this supposition, and show Nathanael that he knew him not from the information of Philip, or any other person, but from his own knowledge, our Lord mentions what none could know but Philip and

 cumstance of sitting under the fig-tree, Chrysost. and Theophyl., with the best modern Commentators, think may be elucidated by supposing that Philip had found Nathanael under a certain fig-tree, and had then, as often before, conversed with him about Christ; and that now our Lord mentions this in order to evince bis divine virtue and power. That seems the true light in which the circumstance is to be considered; for there had been a conversation of only two, nor was there any one present who could tell what had passed at it. The place, too, where the conversation was held, our Lord specified. Hence Nathanael could not but recognise a divine virtue
in Jesus; therefore, full of faith, he gives his testimony in the words "Rabbi" \&c. (Tittm.) That conversation, meditation, and even prayer was carried on under fig-trees, is proved by the Rabbinical citations of Lightf. and Schoettg.

- $\dot{o}$ vids roú $\theta a o v ̄]$ By this the best Commentators are agreed Nathanael meant the Mes-; siah. The term just after "King of Israel" shows that Nathanael thought only of an earthly kingdom. Our Lord, however, confirms his faith, imperfect as it was, in the words following, " Dost thou believe," \&c.

51, 52. тг the scope of these words the Commentators differ; some recognising reproof; others, praise; which view seems best founded. "Our Lord (says Tittm.) at once commends and exhorts. With respect to the words $\alpha^{\prime \pi} \pi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho \tau-v i d \nu$ roü $d \nu 0 \rho \omega \dot{1} \pi o v$, the Commentators are not agreed whether they should be *aken literally to signify such angelic manifestations as those recorded at Matth. iv. 11. xxviii. 2. Ju. ii. 9, 13, 22, \& 43. Acts i. 10.; or figuratively, in the sense, 'you will see me enjoy the especial providence and signal defence of the Almighty; you will see far greater works than this, even mighty miracles wrought by me; so as to leave no doubt of my Messiahship." The latter view is supported by the most eminent modern Commentators, and is preferable. But perhaps the two may be conjoined.
 day after Christ's arrival in Galilee from Bethany. 「ános here denotes a marriage-feast.
2. dк $\lambda_{r} \theta_{\eta}$ ] 'was invited.' On what ground, whether of relationship, or of acquaintance, is variously conjectured. It is most probable that the bride and bridegroom were related to Mary, who, it is supposed, had been $\pi \rho о \mu \nu \eta$ orpia, or $\nu \nu \mu \phi a \gamma \omega \gamma \delta s$, and had been already there making arrangements for the feast, since it is plain that she had the chief direction therein.

On the singular $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \lambda \dot{j} \theta \eta$, before two subjects, one singular and the other plural, see Win. Gr. Gr. $§ 404$. .

3．olvov oúc exouat］This is equivalent to iorepeí oivos；and Kuin．aptly compares Gen． xliii．2．This might very well happen without supposing any excess on the part of the guests， since these festivities lasted a considerable， though not an exact，number of days；and on the present occasion，Jesus and his disciples were probably not calculated on when the wine was provided；and others might be attracted to the company by the fame of our Lord．With what intent the words of Mary were uttered，the Commentators are not agreed．Some suppose them meant to hint that it was time to depart； and our Lord＇s answer，they think，imports that it was not yet time to go．That，however yields a very frigid sense，and supposes something too enigmatical in the words．They were，no doubt， meant to represent the inability of the host to provide a further supply of wine．And from the poverty of our Lord，it is not probable（as some imagine）that this could be a hint to him to pro－ vide a supply．It seems best to suppose，with Chrysost．，and almost all the earlier modern Commentators，that Mary had a view to the removal of the want by miracle．Indeed，con－ sidering the wonderful circumstances of her son＇s birth and childhood，and the recent testimony to his Divine mission by John the Baptist，she was warranted in that expectation．Thus the words may be considered as a hint that it would be proper to commence his Ministry，and prove his Divine mission by a miracle，which should unite a benefit to her friend，together with a manifesta－ tion of his own Divine power．Her directions to the servants plainly evince the above expecta－ tion．Though that our Lord had been accus－ tomed to work miracles in private for the support or comfort of his mother，（as some imagine）is inconsistent with ver．11．，unless the words there be，somewhat violently，taken of public miracles． Thus we shall be enabled to see the force of the words of our Lord＇s answer．

4．Ti $\ddagger \mu o l$ кal $\sigma o l, \gamma \dot{\nu} \nu a \iota ;]$ These words can－ not import（as Commentators usually suppose） strong reprehension．For that would seem un－ merited by the address preceding．As far as the opinion rests on the ruyat，it is utterly un－ founded，since this was a form of address used even to the most dignified persons，and employed by Jesus to his mother on the most affecting of all occasions．As to the other words，$\tau i$ eqoi kal ool，they are a formula taken from the lan－ guage of common life，and must be interpreted according to the occasion and the circumstances of the cace．It usually denotes impatience of intercention or interference，signifying．What hast thou to do with me？as appears from nu－ merous passages，both of the Scriptural and Classical writers，adduced by Wets．and others． The latter would seem to be the sense here；
though it was probably modified by the tone of voice，and softened into a mild rebuke for inter－ fering with him in a matter where her parental claim to respect could have no authority over him．

The words following oũ $\pi \omega-\mu o v$ are taken by the Commentators to mean，＇The right time for my doing what you suggest is not yet come；＇ which implies that he alone is the proper judge of that season，and would seize it when it ar－ rived；thus mixing comfort with mild reproof． By＂the time＂is denoted the time for working a miracle．And that seems to have been when the wine was quite exhausted，and the reality of the miracle would be undoubted．This sense of wpa for кaucos is found both in the Scriptural and Classical writers．

6．$\dot{v} \delta \rho i a t]$ i．e．water vats，or butts for domes－ tic purposes，and the various washings prescribed by the Jewish Law．See Lu．xi． 39.
－ката̀ тd» каӨ．］Kaтá here signifies propter， for the purpose of；a very rare sense，for which the Classical writers use x $\rho \delta \delta$ s．Thus，in a kin－ dred passage of Plutarch，which I have adduced in Recens．Synop．Karà тúXท⿱ то入入à тарท̂баע
 モ̌оутеs．
－diva uerp． $\int$ On the exact quantity desig－ nated by the $\mu \in \tau \rho \eta \pi r^{\circ}$ Commentators and Anti－ quaries are not agreed；nor is it a matter of easy determination．For the term may designate the Hebr．$\pi$ ，to which it answers in the LXX．， i．e．a measure containing $7 \frac{1}{2}$ Gallons；or the Attic measure Metretes，consisting of 9 Gallons． The latter is the more probable；though，even according to the former，the quantity of liquor has been cavilled at by sceptics．But the large－ ness of the quantity would be requisite to place the miracle beyond dispute．Nor will the quan－ tity be thought so enormous for many days con－ sumption of such a number of guests assembled， to which more would now be added by the fame of the miracle，and from curiosity to see the worker of it．Not to say that we need not sup－ pose all the wine to be consumed．The surplus would，no doubt，be very acceptable to the newly married couple．

7．$\gamma \in \mu i \sigma a \tau e-\dot{c o s} \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega]$ These circumstances are not，as some fancy，too minute to be worthy of introduction．They are mentioned to evince the truth and magnitude of the miracle；as in that worked by Elijah， 1 Kings xviii．33－35．， the Prophet in like manner exclaims＂Fill four barrels with water，and pour it，＂\＆c．＂Do it the second time－Do it the third time．＂The words were，no doubt，pronounced，and the thing done，publicly．The order to fill then which was so completely obeyed，render collusion，by procuring and introducing wine，impossible．That what the gueeti

Kai $\lambda e ́ \gamma \in \iota$ аüтois' 'Avt













water was become wine, was likewise evinced in the plainest manner.
8. $\left.{ }^{\rho}{ }^{2} \chi \iota \tau \rho \rho \kappa \lambda i \nu \varphi \varphi\right]$ ] 'the director of the feast,' i.e. a person who was appointed to superintend the preparations and arrangements for a feast, examining the provisions and liquor brought forward, and to pass among the guests to see that they were in want of nothing, and to give the necessary orders to the servants. He was not one of the guests, and did not recline with them
 $\chi^{2}$ ivos is to be distinguished from the $\sigma \nu \mu \pi 0$ -
 and the moderator, arbiter, rex convivii, dictator of the Romans. This latter was one of the guests, chosen sometimes by lot, who presided at the table, and prescribed rules in regard to drinking, \&c. (Wahl.) Walch, Lampe, and Kuin. say, that the Architriclinus was a domestic. Indeed, if he was the same with the Triclinarches of the Romans, he was such. The chief proof, however, is that Juvencus, in his Hist. Evang., terms the Architriclinus a summus minister;'; and that Athenmus L. iv. mentions an $\mathbf{d} \pi$ ordं $\tau$ s $\tau \bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ duaxovias: But that may denote a house-steward. The wine was, as usual, handed to the Architriclinus, in order that he might taste and see if it was worthy of being set before the company.
 what it vas customary to do. And that is illustrated by the Classical citations in Wets. Mefouerv is from $\mu$ etv, (which 1 suspect to be derived from the Northern word Med or Meth) and signifies to moisten, or be moistened with liquor, and in a figurative sense (like the Latin madere vino) to be saturated with drink. In Classical use it generally, but not always implies intoxication. One exception I have myseff adduced in Recens. Synop. In the Hellenistic writers, however, as Joseph., Philo, and the LXX, it (like the Hebr. $7 J w$ ) very often denotes drinking freely, and the hilanty consequent. So in Gen. xliii. 34. it is used of Joseph's brethren. Of the Commentators some adopt the former, some the latter sense. It should seem not very neces. sary to confine ourselves to either, since the Archi-
triclinus is not speaking of the guests present, but only makes a general observation as to what was usual. Tdे é $\lambda \dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega$, ' the inferior wine ;' literally, less good.
11. т $\bar{\omega} \nu \sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i \omega \nu] \Sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i o \nu$ properly denotes 1. a mark or token, by which any thing is known and distinguished from something else; 2. a pledge or assurance, taken in evidence ; 3. a miraculous sign, a miracle, either 1. a miracle in confirmation of the Divine power or legation of the worker of it; or 2. a miracle simply; in which case it is either joined with tepas, or stands by itself. With respect to the definition of a miracle, that by Farmer, as improved by Dr. Maltty, is among the best: "Every sensible deviation from, and every seeming contradiction to, the laws of nature, so far as they are known, must be an evident and incontestible miracle." I have in Recens. Synop. proposed the following, formed chiefly on the masterly reasonings of Professor Brown there detailed. "A miracle may be defined such an interposition and direct agency of the Almighty Power, as either lst, brings forward certain phænomena, which, though not at variance with the general laws of nature, are yet effected without being, as consequents, the result of antecedent causes; or 2 dly , such a direct agency of omnipotence as produces phænomena which the common course of nature (i.e. the ordinary concatenation of antecedents and consequents) never produces; for example, raising the dead, \&c.
 taken emphatically to denote' they fully believed in him.' The кal may be rendered and so, so that, as in Matt. xii. 45. xiii. 22. Lu. ix. 39. Joh. x. 11 . Acts vii. 10 and sometimes in the Sept.
 tators antient and modern are of opinion that St. John mentions four Passovers as occurring during Christ's ministry, of which they reckon this as the 1st ; that mentioned at v . 1 . the 2 d. ; that at vi.4. the 3d. ; and that at which Christ suffered as the $4 t h$. Thus his ministry will extend to three years and a half. Others, however, diminish the number of Passovers, and consequently suppose it to have been much shorter.















14．cijpev－mmגoùvtas］The best Commen－ tators antient and modern are generally agreed that this circumstance was prior to and conse－ quently different from the similar one recorded at Matth．xxi．12．sq．Others think they were the same；the chronology of the Evangelists not being exact．There was a great propriety in this symbolical action（which denoted the puri－ fication of the Jewish Religion）being used both at the beginning and the close of Christ＇s mi－ nistry．
－Bóas］＇bullocks，＇not oren，for by the Law of Moses no mutilated beast（as an ox）could be offered in sacrifice．The number of victims （as we learn from Josephus）sometimes amounted to $2,500,000$ ；and it is evident from the Rab－ binical writers that immense traffic was carried on in cattle \＆c．for victims，and much extortion practised；a great part of the profits of which came to the Priests．Even at the best very great indecorum was practised．The кє $\rho \mu$ ．here are the same with the ко入入vßเซтal at Matt．xxi． 12.
 or bands made of rushes \＆c．，such as were likely to be used for tying up the cattle．We need not， however，suppose much，if any，use made of the $\phi \rho a \gamma \in \lambda \lambda_{c o \nu}$ ，except to serve for a symbolical action．Besides，there was no need of stripes． The traffickers，conscious of the unlawfulness of their proceedings，and struck by the Divine energy of our Lord，would not hesitate to obey his injunctions，especially as the crowd of ap－ proving and admiring bystanders would be ready to enforce that order．
－кє́р $\mu a]$ This signifies small coin，from neipm． For the most antient coins，especially Oriental， being（like Spanish rials）of a square form ad－ mitted of being cut，so as to form the lesser kind of money．＇EEdXee is especially applicable to minute coin．
－גуе́वтречe］Some would read $\dot{\nu}$ е́т $\rho \in \psi e$, from certain Miss．But though that is more accordant with Classicul usage，it is，no doubt， ex interpretatione．＇Avartpétety was probably used in the common dialect for $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{a} \rho \dot{\operatorname{sen}}$ etv．
17．$\delta$ 乌̄̈ $\overline{\text { os }}$－$\mu$ ．］This brought to our Lord＇s
mind the words of Ps．1xix．9．Katéфays is an Oriental and emphatical metaphor，appropriate not only to grief or indignation，as here，but to other of the more violent passions，which（in the words of Gray）＂inly gnaw the heart．＂See Job xix．22．and the Classical passages adduced by Lampe and myself in Recens．Synop．Z $\mathrm{Z} \lambda$ 入os roû oikou signifies，not zeal of，but zeal for ；and the Aorist катє́фayє signifies esedere solet．The kal is intensive．
For катé申аүє，катафа́yerat is found in very many antient MSS．and early Edd．，and is adopted by almost all the recent Editors．

18．ört］＇seeing that．＇
19．入ǘaテe тод עад̀ r．］An acutè dictum， uttered to draw the attention of the bystanders； the understanding of which，however，might be aided by action，our Lord pointing to his own body，the temple of the Logos．Thus the Hebrews used to call the body a $\sigma \kappa \bar{\eta} \nu o s$, אהד． See Note on 2 Cor．v．1．Nay，Philo calls it $\nu a d s$ ，or i $¢ \rho d \nu$ ，with reference to the dignity of the soul which tenants it．Indeed，סغцas and douni（found in the sense of boly in Lycophr．783．） both denote a building，and St．Paul often speaks of the body of a Christian as being a temple of the Holy Spint．＾úes is for кaтa入úetv．The Imper． here，as often，has a permissive sense，q．d．you may destroy，which differs little from the hypn－ thetical sense，Be it that you destroy．Our Lord means to say，that his resurrection from the dead will be the especial sign by which his Divine mission shall be declared．
20．тебгарdкоvтa－oitos］The sense is： －Forty and six years hath this Temple been a building．＇The use of the Aorist will permit， and facts require this rendering．For it was then the 46 th year since the time when Herod com－ menced the building．He formed it on the ruinous one originally erected by Zorobabel，using the old materials，and sometimes probably the old foundation．In consequence of which，and espe－ cially as it was raised by parts，the old buildings being gradually pulled down，and new ongs erected in their place；so the edifice was called Zorobabel＇s，and the second Temple＇ even Josephus so terms it．
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 parison of those parts of the U.T. which predict the Messiah's rising from the dead, both with Jesus' words, and with the fact of his resurrecion, they thoroughly believed in the inspiration of the Scriptures and the divine mission of Jesus.

23. $\sigma \eta \mu \in \bar{i} a]$ What these were we know not. But from this passage and from iv. 45. \& vi. 2. it is certain that Christ worked many miracles not recorded by the sacred writers.
 however, it appears from what follows, was only an external and historical, not an internal and vital, one. The understanding was convinced, but not the will subdued to obedience.
24. oúk ḋтioteved '̇autd̀ aútois] Some Commentators take this to mean, "he did not trust his person (i.e. his life and safety) to them.' But this is somewhat frigid; and it is better, with the most eminent Commentators antient and modern, to interpret the phrase figuratively, $\dot{\epsilon} \alpha \nu \tau \delta \nu$ meaning his viers and designs, as follows: 'he did not place any implicit confidence in, carried himself cautiously and circumspectly towards them,' and did not instruct them in the capita doctrine, or avow himself as Messiah. The complate knouled ge of the hearts of men which is then ascribed to Christ, is among the other irrefragable proofs of his Divinity; for omniscience is the attribute of God alone.
III. 1. $\alpha \rho \chi \omega \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ 'I.] From vii. 50. \& xix. 39. it appears that the expression denotes a member of the Sanhedrim, and usually by office, a Jurist. The following narration is introduced to illustrate the omniscience of our Lord, just before mentioned. On the intention of Nicodemus in seeking this interview with Jesus, and on the real scope and subject of the discourse held with him, Commentators are not agreed. With respect to the former, some have recognised a bad motive, such as pride cloaked under pretended humility,-craftiness and dissimulation subservient to a purpose of treachery. But the best Commentators antient and modern ascribe a good motive. They recogmise in him integrity and worth, united with ingenuousness and diffidence, though coupled
with timidity. Most Commentators are of obinon that his purpose and intention in coming was, to learn the true mode of attaining justificatron with God, and the right way to obtain salvation. let many of the best of our modern Commentators are of another opinion. Though they admit that there is an obscurity arising from highly figurative language, in the former part of the discourse, so expressed in order to excite the attention of Nicodemus; yet they think that it may be understood from the reply of our Lord at ver. 14. The scope, however, will better appear by tracing the sense of the words as they arise. It may be premised 1. that Nicodemus seems to have regarded Jesus rather in the light of a divinely commissioned teacher than of the Messiah. 2. That this narration need not be considered as giving the whole of the conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus, but only the substance of it, especially the answers of Jesus; which has greatly tended to produce obscurity. Nicodemos's coming by night, or, as some interpret the עuктós, lute in the evening, cannot, in spite of the defence of Tittm., be imputed to aught but caution and fear of the Sanhedrim.
25. Td ${ }^{\prime}$ 'I $\eta \sigma o \bar{u} \nu$ ] Many MSS. and some Yerpions and Fathers have aividy, which is adopted by almost all the recent Editors. As, however, the MS. authority is not strong, and that of Versions but slender; and as the internal evedene for and against it is nearly equal, I have not ventured to receive it.

- olòapev] This, by an idiom found in all languages, may only mean, 'it is commonly known.

3. $\dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \kappa \rho i \theta \eta \dot{\prime}$ 'I $\eta \sigma o u s-\dot{e} \alpha \nu \nu \mu \eta$ \&c.] With the words of our Lord's reply Commentators are not a little perplexed, since they seem to have no relation to what Nicodemus had just said. Many antient and modern Interpreters regard the words as a refutation of some erroneous notion propounded by him. Others, with more reason, suppose them said to furnish Vic. with certain information for which he had been asking. The words of that inquiry, they think, are unrecorded by the Evangelist. But, however we may sup-


pose some others of Nicodemus's inquiries passed over by the Evangelist, it is difficult to imagine that this should have been unrecorded. The best mode of removing the difficulty is to suppose (with Beza, Lampe, Tittm., and others) that our Lord interrupted Nic. in his address; and, in order to increase his faith by evincing his knowledge of his heart, without waiting till he should have propounded his inquiry, anticipated him by replying to it while yet in thought. What, then, was this intended inquiry? Not, many recent Commentators say, on the mode of attaining eternal salvation; for that would imply a far greater advancement in spiritual knowledge than Nic. then possessed. Grot., Lampe, Tittm., Kuin., and others are agreed that it was of the Messiah, his person, and the nature of the salvation to be expected of him. Yet to this, it may be said, the words of v. 3. sqq. are no answer. But, remarks Tittm., the words from v. 3. to 13., though not an ansicer to the inquiry, are an important admonition introductory to the answer, which follows at ver. 14. seqq. "In this (continues Tittm.) our Lord warns him of the difficulty to prejudiced Jews of comprehending what the question involved; and that until those prejudices, which blinded their minds, were got rid of, and a totally new mind assumed, they would never understand the doctrine which he had to propound; an entire change of thinking and acting was indispensable to participate in the benefits of the Messiah's kingdom.' On this, however, 1 shall remark further on.

- $\left.\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \theta^{1} \hat{\eta} \tilde{a} \nu \nu_{0} \theta \in \nu\right]$ Some of the earlier Commentators take $\alpha^{2} \nu \omega \theta \in \nu$ to mean from abore, i. e. from heaven. But this is refuted by the words of Nicodemus's answer, in which he understands by our Lords words סéutepò yevעท $\theta \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota$. The best Commentators are agreed that it means $a_{g}$ ain ; and this sense is confirmed by most of the antient Versions; and the signification is found in Gal. iv. 9., the IXX., and Josephus; nor is it unknown in the Classical writers. The phrase d dumeev revvn升ivat is equivalent to dya$\gamma^{\prime}$ perly a new generation, but figuraticely an entire alteration, i. e. reformation. Thus it was used by the Jews of a change by baptism from Heathenism to Judaism, and was also applied figuratively to the moral reformation typified by that baptism. So that they called the new convert a new creature. Many Commentators, indeed, take the expression here as said of moral rege: neration. And it is true that divayévyuous and other similar expressions do occur in that sense in the N.T. But the best Commentators are agreed that, from the probity and good moral character of Nic., there was no necessity for our Lord to abruptly tell him there should be a complete change of heart. (See more in Recens. Synop.) And most of them maintain that the regeneration here meant is baptismal regeneration. Wets., too, proves by citations both from Rabbinical and Classical writers, that it was the custom, both among Jews and Gentiles, to designate the embracing a new religion under the figure of a neur hirth, and to call it regeneration. The moat eminent, however, of the recent Com-
mentators, as Rosenm., Kuin., and Tittm., maintain that $\chi \epsilon \nu \nu \eta \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a t \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$ here denotes a total change of opinion as to the Messiah, the nature of his kingdom, and the benefits thereof. But though that interpretation is in some respects very agreeable to the context, yet in others it is not so. Thus, for instance, the words at v. 5.
 plainer way of expressing the same thing) will not admit such a sense. Besides, nothing can be more certain, from a comparison of the passage at v.3. and 5 , with the words at v. 7. $\mu \dot{\eta}$
 $\nu a c \dot{\alpha} \nu \cos \theta \in \nu$. Not to say that there is no proof that $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \theta_{i} \nu a l \dot{\alpha} \nu \omega \theta \in \nu$ was ever used simply of a change of sentiment, or mode of thinking. Moreover, the same course of reasoning which rejects this interpretation is equally cogent for the rejection of the before-mentioned one, moral regeneration. There seems, then, to be no doubt but that the true sense is that assigned by almost all the antient Fathers and Commentators, and all the more eminent of the earlier modern Commentators, who take the words of baptismal regeneration. I would also venture to suggest, that the obscurity, as concerns the subject of the "inquiry" which Nicodemus is said to have gone to put to Jesus, may be thus removed. Nic. probably did not go to make any one inquiry, e.gr. as to the person of the Messiah and the nature of his kingdom; but rather to ask several questions as to those points in which the Religion he professed seemed to him defective; and also to enquire how far a reformation of them might be expected from the Messiah, and the nature of his kingdom. Our Lord, however. interrupts him, and cuts off all occasion for such special discussions by telling him at once, that there must be a total change of Religion (implying a total change of opinions, feelings, and moral habits) and a new one solemnly entered upon by the usual symbol of baptism, and that a new and peculiar one, typifying the sanctification of the inner man. He then procceds to point out that no one is enabled or authorized to promulgate this new Religion but the Son of Man, the Messiah, proceeding from Heaven and the bosom of his Father to enlighten and to save the world, of which the latter purpose would alone be effected by the sacrifice of himself on the cross to atone for the sins of the world and to reconcile it unto God.
Upon the whole, I do not conceive that any thing of the least consequence in this conversation has been left unrecorded by the Evangelist. He has, no doubt, given the full sum and substance of what was said by our Lord; and to have expressed this in more words, though it might have rendered the work of interpretation easier to us, yet was not very necessary to those for whom he formed his Gospel. As to Nicodemus's interrogations, if those unrecorded were of no greater consequence than those recorded, the loss is not very great. Besides, it is far from certain that after using the words expressive of a wish for further information, m由̄s dúvaтal тaüra $\gamma_{\text {evéofat, he put any more regular questions. }}$ He prohably left Jesus to express himselfop the
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nature and purposes of the new Religion, and the means whereby these were to be effected, without interruption.
Having treated thus at large on the intent of Vic. in this visit, and on the scope and purpose of what was said by our Lord, it will be the less necessary to enter into minute details on the sense of the words as they occur.
 being taken in a physical sense; and such is assigned to them by the generality of Commentatars. That, however, would imply such incredible ignorance on the part of Nicodemus that the best modern and especially the recent Commentators are agreed that they must be taken in a figurative one. And they paraphrase thus: 'As it involves not only a physical impossibility, but a moral unfitness, for a man of riper years to be born again; so it is scarcely less impossible for any one at that age to be morally born again, and adopt a totally different mode of thinking.' Sic. probably understood by $\gamma \in \nu \nu \eta \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota \alpha \nu \nu \omega \theta \in \nu$ a total change of sentiment on matters of religion, and especially on the highly interesting subject which then engaged the attention of the reflecting, the person of the Messiah, and the nature of his kingdom. That regeneration in this sense was not unknown to the antient Jews, has been shown by Schoettl. Not to say that the Stoical Patingenesiu (which was of the very same nature) was probably not unknown to Sic. His meaning seems to be, that Jesus requires too much of the Jews. To which our Lord replies by repeating his former assertion, but more plainly and definitely.

5. $\grave{\epsilon} \xi$ їòatos nil tvev́matos] The üóaqos must be taken of baptism, as often in Scripture. See Titus iii. 5. So it was certainly understood by St. Clement. See Rec. Syn. By $\pi \nu \epsilon \bar{u} \mu a$ the best Commentators are agreed is here meant the influences of the Holy Spirit. Comp. v. 8. with Titus iii. 5. and Lu. xviii. 26. sq. This, however, will not prove that baptismal regeneration is all that is necessary to salvation. For though baptism does cleanse us from original sin, and communicate the grace of the Holy Spirit, and place us in a state of acceptance and justification, yet there is great need of the constant renewing of the Holy Spirit in order to preserve us in a state of acceptance here, and secure our admittance into Heaven hereafter; which renewing will gra-
dually produce that moral regeneration which is carried forward throughout our whole lives, and which some Theologians are too apt to confound with Baptismal regeneration.
 interpreted in two ways. By Resh some Commentators understand natural vice; and by Spirit, the Holy Spirit, and the reformation of heart it effects. This is quite agreeable to the usage of Scripture. Others, however, as Wets., Kuin., and Tittm., think there is reference to the opinion of the Jews, that they were especially objects of God's favour on account of their progenitors, and alone heirs of salvation. By fish they understand human nature; and by wvē̄цa, spiritual birth. Thus the sense will be, that the Jews have no claim of right to admission into the Messiah's kingdom on the score of nativity, but receive it by the Divine dispositions excited through the medium of the Holy Spirit. An interpretation not unsupported by the context, and which is agreeable to the use of Scripture. But the other is the more simple and, I conceive, the true one. The purpose of the verse is to show the necessity of this regeneration, baptismal and moral, for obtaining that spirituality without which no one can attain unto salvation.
6. The argument here is, that however, incredible this regeneration may seem, it ought not to be thought impossible, any more than the many wonderful phenomena in nature, which are obvious to the senses, though their causes defy all explanation. An example is then taken from the wind, on the causes of which see an interesting extract from Vogler in Recens. Synop. Though, as I have there observed, the expressions need not be interpreted with philosophical subtilty, but according to popular notions; for the inestigations of Wolf, Wets., and others have proved that both the Hebrews and the antients in general were accustomed (by a sort of proverb) to signify any thing unknown or obscure by comparing it with the wind.
7. $\pi \bar{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ - yevécoat] By тaùta is meant $\tau \dot{a}$ $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} d \nu a \gamma \in \nu \nu \eta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \cos$, and the phrase seems to be only a popular mode of professing that he does not well comprehend how this can be effected or be thought necessary.
8. os Sod. move 'I.] Bp. Middy. accounts for the use of the Article by supposing that $\dot{\delta} \delta i \delta$. $\tau 0 \bar{v}$ 'I. was a name given to Nicodemus by his followers.
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$\Lambda_{n}$ opinion adopted by Professor Scholefield, and supported by a passage from Plato. But the term master in Israel is proved by the citations from the Rabbinical writers in Lightf., Wets., and Schoettg., to have been so frequent, (amounting to Doctor of Laws or Theology with us) that it would not have been proper to take it as a distinctire appellation. I cannot but suspect that the Article was here erroneously used
 followed.
9. ò oìaцеу- $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho o u ̄ \mu e \nu]$ The best Commentators are agreed that the plural is here used, either agreeably to the usage of persons in authority, (see Mark iv. 30.) or on a principle scarcely less frequent, namely, out of modesty, The clause ô $\begin{gathered}\text { єop } \\ \text {. } \mu \alpha \rho \tau \text {. is more significant than }\end{gathered}$ the former. They both express that complete knorledge which Christ, as united with God the Father, could not but possess. This, too, implies knowledge by a virtue of his own, and not by revelation.
10. $\tau \alpha \dot{d} \dot{d} i y \in t a]$ i. e. earthly doctrines, such as that of regeneration by water and the Spirit, so called because they are things done upon earth, and therefore to be comprehended. By iroupávia is meant, as Doddr. says, the doctrines mentioned in the remaining part of our Lond's discourse with Nic. But to what he mentions may be added other doctrines which, though not adverted to in this conversation, were afterwards revealed by the Holy Spirit, namely, the mysterious union of Christ with God, and bis being subject to death not only for the Jews, but the Gientiles; such like things as are by St. Paul termed $\mu v \sigma \tau \eta i \rho i a, ~ a n d ~ b y ~ S t . ~ P e t e r ~$ дибขónta.
11. кal oùdeis dvaßé $\beta \eta \kappa e v$-où $\rho a v e ̄]$ The sense is, 'And no one has ever ascended to heaven, to bring down this information, nor can any one except the Son of man (i.e. the Messiah) reveal the counsels of God for the salvation of man,' i.e. No one knoweth the counsels of God but I who came down from Him. This use of a verb (as dvaßaivw) to express something which is the purpose or intent of the action is remarkable; (Comp. Deut. xxx. 12. Prov. xxx. 4. Baruch iii. 29. Rom. x. 6.) and the obscurity bere is to be ascribed to that modesty with which our Lord ever veiled his claim to Divinity, which he here rather leaves to be inferred than expresies it.
The in is by many recent Commentators taken in a past sense; and, so long ago, Socinus and Glass. There are, however, very few unexceptionable examples of such a sense, i. e. where aiv is not accompanied by some particle denoting time past, e. gr. Thucyd. i. 132. aivìp A., жaidiкa
note $\omega \hat{\nu}$ aùroû. But that is quite another case. The $\omega^{\omega} \nu$ is, $I$ conceive, of the Present indefinite, and the sense of $\dot{\delta}$ av dy oip., ' whose proper dwelling place is in heaven.' All this (as Tittm. remarks) points (as often) at the communion of nature and Divine majesty which Christ had with the Father before he came to the earth. I must not omit to remark (after Schoettg. and others) that the phrase divaß. els тò oùpa$\nu \dot{\nu}$ is used agreeably to the language commonly employed of one who announced any revelation, that he had ascended to heaven and fetched his knowledge from thence. Karaß. íк тoū oùp. of course implies divine legation. Tittm. justly
 тoù $\Theta e o$ ù implies nature and birth. The Messiah, Jesus says, was to be not only Son of God, but alone in his kind, ( $\mu$ yoyevi) that he came down from heaven, his dwelling-place; all which can be said of no mere man. And when he declares himself the object of faith, on whom the salvation of every man depends, he mentions what is applicable to God alone. Hence by Son of God is to be understood a Being equal with the Father not only in office and function, but in nature and origin.
12. Here our Lord proceeds to illustrate by example the $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi$ Loupáva mentioned at v. 12. ; and he selects as the subject the work which the Messiah should especially come to accomplish. This he does because that was a subject on which the Jews (and, no doubt, Nicodemus) were exceedingly in the dark. They thought that the Messiah would come alone for the purpose of redressing their national wrongs, restoring them to liberty, and at their head subduing and ruling over the Gentile nations during a reign to which they conceived no limits. The doctrine, however, of a suffering and dying Messiah our Lord as yet, from caution, revealed, even to Nicodemus, veiled under figure and znigma; and though meant to stimulate his attention, it probably was very imperfectly comprehended by him then, though he would afterwards bring it to mind, and both see the full truth and recognise a solemn prediction fulfilled. The figurative way of expressing it was this: The Messiah must (it is destined that he should) be suspended on high, as was the brazen serpent in the wilderness. (Comp. viii. 28. \& xii. 22. \& 32.) This is plain from v. 16. It is not, however, agreed on among the Commentators whether this brazen serpent was meant to be a type of Christ crucified. Almost all the antient, and nearly all the modern Commentators up to the middle of the 18th Century, maintain the affirmative. But the negative has (after Greg. Naz.) been supported by nearly all Commentators since the
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time of Vitringa, especially by Kain., A. Clarke, and Tittm., whom see in Recess. Synop. And this should seem to be the most correct view. There is only a comparison, namely, as to the kind of death, and its cause; which turns 1. on Christ's being suspended on the cross as the brazen serpent was suspended aloft by Moses; 2. that as all who looked with faith upon the serpent were cured of the bite of the fiery serpents, so will all who have faith in a crucified Saviour not perish, but have everlasting life.
15. Tva $\pi \bar{\alpha} s$-aicipıov] Our Lord here adverts to the causes and the effects. The causes were 1. to save the human race from utter perdition, which would have overwhelmed them from sin, original and actual. 2. to acquire for them eternal salvation. The effects were 1. deliverance from perdition; and 2. restoration to the favour of God, which is "better than life."

16-21.] Most of the recent Commentators (as did Erasm. formerly) regard these verses as the words not of Jesus, but of the Evangelist. This they argue from certain repetitions, the style, and other matters of doubtful disputation. So that there is no reason to abandon the common opinion, that they are a continuation of our Lord's discourse. Tiv кó $\mu \mu$ od is, as Grot., Lightf., and Tittm. remark, meant to show that the salvation to be obtained by the Saviour was to be extended to all the nations of the earth, and held out to every individual of the human race, in contradiction to the notion of the Jews, that he would come to bless and save them alone. Comp. 1 Joh. ii. 2. "E $\delta \infty \kappa \kappa \nu$ is here equivalent to $\pi a \rho \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\delta} \omega \kappa \in \nu$, and signifies 'hath delivered him to death ;' which implies that he was a ransom for a sinful world. Comp. Lu. xxii. 19. Rom. viii. 32. Gal. i. 4.
17. Titty. observes, that what is said from v. 17 to 21. was levelled against the Jewish
nation, that the Messiah would come for the benefit of the Jews only, nay, would rather destroy the Gentiles. K $\rho$ ing is said to be for катакрivy, and to have the sense punish and destroy. We may render: 'God sent his Son into the world not to exercise severe judgment and inflict punishment on any nation of the world, but that every one of them, through his atonement, might be put into the way of salviaton.' This truth is repeated at $v$. 18., but so as to show that there will be no distinction between Jew and Gentile, since every one, of whatever nation, will have part in this salvation. Our Lord, however, engrafts upon it another senti-
 to perdition for refusing the offers of salvation, but he is already as good as punished, so certain is his condemnation; or, he is already miserable by the slavery of sin, nay, he is self-condemned and past all hope of salvation.
 Commentators are agreed, that by spics is meant not the punishment itself, but the occassion of the crime and the cause of the punishmont. "Christ (explains Kuin.) is not the cause of injury and misery to man, nor is it to be attributed to his doctrine, but the blame rests with men themselves, who reject his saluteary precepts."
20,21 . The sentiment at $\mathbf{v} .21$. is here further illustrated, and the discourse concludes with a gnome generalis, showing the pernicious effects of passion and prejudice on all inquiries after truth.

- фaüla] The word properly signifies little, paltry; and 2. worthless, naughty, vicious. 'o
 and in some other passages of the N.T. is that of rectitude and goodness, as opposed to what is base and vicious. So in 1 Cor. xiii. 6. a $\lambda \lambda^{\prime} \theta_{\text {e ca }}$ is opposed to doixia. The expression to do the truth is often found in the Rabbinical writings.
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In dey $\boldsymbol{\theta c a p}$ the $\dot{d} \nu$ corresponds to the Hebr. $\mathbf{I}$, and signifies agreeably to; and $\theta$ cậ, 'God's will.' On dं ${ }^{2} \gamma \chi^{\theta} \hat{\eta}$ just before see Note on Ephes. v. 13. and my Note on Thucyd. vi. 38. No. 15.
22. ठıе́т $\rho \iota \beta \epsilon$ ] Sub. x ${ }^{2}$ óvov, ' staid.'

- $\$ \beta \alpha \pi$ rictcv] i. e. through the medium of his disciples ; for Christ did not himself baptize. See iv. 2. Thus what a King's servants do is ascribed to himself. Our Lord declined this, no doubt, from modesty, hecause baptism bound them to religious obedience to himself, and therefore was better administered by another. Why St. Paul baptized few or none, was because of his being always engaged in more important avocations; and that solemn initiatory rite could as well be performed by any other person.

23. ن̈ $\partial a \tau a$ mo $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ ] ' many streams,' i. e. from the adjunct, much water. A sense (perhaps proceeding from Hebraism) often occurring in the Revelations. At тареүivovto and ¿ßатт. sub. defocosoi.

 dlet., and Kuin. supply tıJi; an ellip. not unfrequent after a Genitive; but here not necessary to be resorted to, since $i \kappa$, like the Hebr. $D$, may mean 'on the part of,' and thus the same sense will be expressed as if $\tau \iota \sigma l$ had been written; with the addition that this will hint that the dispute originated with John's disciples. For the common reading, 'Loudaloy, very many Versions and Fathers have Iovoaiou, which is preferred by most of the Commentators, and adopted by almost all the Editors from Wets. to Scholz ; and with reason; for the ellip. of $\tau$ tuds is frequent, whereas that of $\tau$ ıvcì would be anomalous. Besides, the change of 'Ioudaiou into 'Ioudatove was likely to take place from the plural just before. This Jew is supposed to have been one of those who had been baptized by Christ's disciples. Kafapırرoì must, from the context, denote baptismel purification (as 2 Pet. i. 9), but out of that discussion, it seems, arose another on the comparative efficacy of the baptisms of John and
of Jesus, and the dignity of those two personages.
24. iv $\mu$ età $\sigma o \bar{u}$ ] These words denote Jesus' attendance on John to be baptized. The words $\Psi^{\top} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \dot{\nu} \mu е \mu а \rho \tau$. have, I conceive, not so much reference to the testimony borne by John to Jesus, as to the increase of Jesus' celebrity, and credit consequent on it. They thought that John, through excess of modesty, had magnified the dignity of Jesus, whom, it is plain, they did not consider as the Messiah. The oüros does not (as Wets. imagines) imply contempt, for that feeling they could not entertain towards Jesus. And although that sense is often found in the Classical writers, yet I know of scarcely a single certain example in the N.T. Nay it is sometimes used of Christ by the Evangelists, as
 חd $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ es, for ol $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o l$, very many, by an hyperbole usual to those who speak under the influence of passion and prejudice.
27-30. Here the Baptist checks their excessive attachment to himself and envy at Jesus, first hy showing the real nature of Jesus' person, by a gnome generalis, "A man can receive nothing except it be given him from above." By this common, and, as it seems, proverbial dictum, he means to say, that he himself can take nothing to himself that God has not given him : nor can Jesus; therefore whatever is done by him, happens by the providence of God. Then he proceeds to disavow that superior dignity, which his disciples ascribed to him ; reminding them of his public and private avowal, that he was not the Messiah, but only his forerunner; sent for the very purpose of making him known and promoting his celebrity. (Tittm.) The subject is then inlustrated by a similitude drawn from common life, in tracing the force of which some Commentators obscure rather than illustrate the subject by references to Jewish Antiquities. Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm., are rightly agreed that there is merely an illustration by similitude, (as in Matt. ix. 15. and Mark ii. 19.) in which

25. 

${ }^{n}$ Infr. 5. 20. et 8.26 . et 8.26 .48 . et 12.48. et 14.10 . ${ }_{10} 1$ Joh. $5 . \lambda$ 10. pSupr. 1. 16.







John compares Christ to the bridegroom at a marriage feast, and himself to the тара́vขрфоs, or brideman, who was a friend employed to procure the spouse, and acted as his agent throughout the whole affair. There were, indeed, two paranymphs, one on the part of the bridegroom, the other on that of the bride, who acted as mediators to preserve peace and harmony between the new married pair. The allusion at $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \omega$ s
 traced. The words are most probably supposed to allude to the ceremony of the formal interview, previous to marriage, of the betrothed pair, who were brought together by the rapávouфos to a private apartment ; at the door of which they were themselves stationed, so as to be able to distinguish any elevation of voice on the part of the sponsus addressing the sponsa, from which, and from the tone of it, they would easily infer his satisfaction at the choice made for them, and feel corresponding joy. The sease, then, may be thus expressed. As in the ceremonies pertaining to marriage the sponsus is the principal person, and his paranymphus willingly cedes to him the preference, and rejoicing in his acceptance, contents himself with playing an under part, so do I willingly sustain the part of a humble forerunner to Christ.' Пешतrpwтat, is complete, consummate.
31. To cut off all future occasion for comparison, John shows that there will be less and less room for it; since the celebrity of the one must increase, that of the other decrease ; and so resplendent will be the glory of the former, as to cast that of the latter into the shade, and cause it to fade away like the morning star, or the waning moon at sun-rise. (Tittm. \& Euthym.) 31-36. The Commentators are not agreed whether these are to be considered as the words of John the Evangelist, or of John the Baptist. The former is the opinion of most recent Commentators, and grounded on the style and manner here being that of the Evangelist. That, bowever, may be considered a fallacious argument. It seems better to adopt, with almost all antient and most modern Commentators, the latter view. For, as Tittm. remarks, "there is a perfect coherence of these words with the preceding, without the interposition of any expression, from which it could be inferred that what follows is from the Evangelist. Nor does there appear any reason why he should have added these words, and chosen to confirm by his own judgment the testimony of John the Baptist, which must have been to his readers alike remarkable and deserving of credit. On the other hand, there are obvious reasons why this passage should be from John the Baptist; for in it he seems to have intended to make mention of the causes by which
he could confirm what he had said in the preceding words, namely, that the precedence is due, not to him, but to Jesus; and thas it is just that his fame should be spread, and the number of his disciples be increased, inasmuch as he was sent from heaven, endowed with gifts immeasurably great ; nay, was the belored Son of God, the Lord and expected Saviour of the human race."
'O anvolen dpx. plainly involves the pre-existence and Divinity of Christ. Here we must supply кal èk тoú oùpavov̂ $\lambda a \lambda \in \bar{t}$, to correspond
 denotes one who is of earthly origin, as opposed to heavenly. The sense is : ' $A$ mere man is not endued with appropriate knowledge of divine things, has not an intimate acquaintance with the secret counsels of God, such as He possesses who is of celestial origin (to whom God giveth not the spirit by measure, v. 34.); he, therefore, teacheth, and can teach, only what is earthly, incomplete, and imperfect. But he who is endued by God with a complete knowledge of heavenly things, is thoroughly conversant with the counsels of God, is, from his origin, superior to all men in dignity, and far exceeds even the Prophets in spiritual knowledge.' See more in Tittm, ap. Recens. Synop.
With ó $\hat{\omega}$ ap. Stobaei Serm. Eth. p. 98. Td yaip $\beta$ קóracios бтер $\mu^{\prime}$ ефпиє́ри фроуєіً. At ó єсораке каl
 taken from $\dot{\ell} \kappa$ rov̀ oupanoü. The cal sigaifies 'and [yet].' Oidels, few or nome ; of which hyperbole (frequent in passages of high wrought pathos) I have adduced several examples in Recens. Synop.
33. John here corrects the grievous error of undervaluing Jeans, by showing (of course, with an admission of Jesus' Messiahship) that he who believeth or hath faith in Christ, hath it in God.
 edect $\xi_{1}$, and signifies attests, confirws, professes his belief; a metaphor taken from deeds signed and sealed. For as testimonies of contracts, or other engagements, were confirmed by the addition of a seal, any confirmation of truth was called oфpayls; and as by the imposition of a seal any thing is rendered unsuspected of frawd, sure and certain, therefore, $\sigma \boldsymbol{\phi} \rho a \gamma / \zeta \in \omega$ came to mean to confirm, as here and in Eph. i. 13. 2 Cor. i. 22. Sap. ii. 5.
 É $\kappa$ мérpov with verbs of giving, denotes sparinghy, restrictedly. And so the Latin ad demensum tribuere. Oíк éк $\mu$ étpou, per meiooin, denoter in an infinite degree. The best Commentators are agreed that there is an allusion to the Prophets, the very greatest of them being allowed
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by the Jewish Rabies to have only had the gifts of the Holy. Spirit with measure; and thus the infinite superiority of Christ is manifest. On the particulars of this unbounded power, see
 which occurs just after.
35. ж $\dot{\alpha} y \tau a$ i. e. whatever is necessary to procure the salvation of man.
36. Here are declared the consequences of faith, and also of want of faith, in Christ. In the former clause exec is not (as most Commentatars imagine) simply for " ${ }^{\text {Eec t, }}$ but the Present is used, to show the certainty of the thing; ' it is laid up for him.' By $\dot{\delta} d \pi e i t=\bar{y} y$ is meant he who refuseth this faith; though there may be, as Doddr. thinks, an allusion to that principle of unreserved obedience to Christ, which can alone make faith available. Oüк on $\psi$ eta 乡oriv is a Hebrew phrase denoting ' he shall never possess eternal life.' The words following suggest the reasim, namely, the wrath of God and the guilt of sin abide on him, are not removed by the atoning merits of the Saviour.
IV. In this Chapter is recorded an important discourse of Christ with a Samaritan woman, for illustrating the purpose and sense of which, the Evangelist prefaces the narration with some particulars respecting the occasion which led to that discourse.
 making more disciples than John, and is [even] baptizing them.'
4. cot de avid $\delta$.] ' now he must needs pass through.' It was so far necessary, as being a shorter route than through Periaa.
5. єрхєтat cis] 'comes unto, as far as;' for from v.6. it appears that he took up his quarters cuntsile of the city, near a well; though his disciples entered it, to procure provisions, and on
returning from thence found Jesus talking with a Samaritan woman. Euxd́p. Originally called $\Sigma \nu \chi \grave{\mu} \mu$, from the name of the person of whose descendants Jacob bought the land and built an altar. See Gen. xxxiii. 18. The name is supposed to have been altered by the Jews to $\Sigma v x a \rho$, to denote the drunkenness and idolatry of the inhabitants.
6. кєкотtaккis] Neut. in a passive sense. On the force of obvious the Commentators differ. Some regard it as pleonastic; but that is only eluding the difficulty: others render it therefore, or afterwards ; for neither of which significations is there any authority. The true interpretation seems to be that of the antients and several amineat moderns, who take oü̃cos for oui coss $\operatorname{sis} \dot{\eta} \nu$, or cis '̈TvXev, ‘just as he was,' i. e. on the ground. See Hor. Od. ii. 11, 13. Lamp observes, that Jesus stopped there, not only for the sake of rest, hut as being a very convenient dining place. So
 $\pi \rho d s \pi \eta \gamma \bar{\eta} \dot{\text { üdatos. }}$
7. $\gamma$ vii es rims Eau.] This means not a woman from Samaria; but is, by an clip. of oüra, equivalent to $\gamma v \nu \dot{\prime}$ ' इapapeitis in the next verse. She had, no doubt, come from Sychar. Dós $\mu o l$ mitiv. The verb is employed as a noun; of which the Commentators adduce several examples from the Greek and Latin Classics.
9. $\pi \bar{\omega} \dot{s} \sigma \dot{v}, \& c \mathrm{c}$.] She expresses wonder at any favour, however small, being asked by a Jew from a Samaritan. The reason for this the Evangeist subjoins, for the information of his Greek readers, in the words oi $\gamma \alpha \rho, \& c$., where $\sigma v \gamma x$ must be understood of familiar intercourse and society ; (So Euthym. explains by out ко七עшyoũat.) for the intercourse of buying and selling was still kept up. $\Sigma u \gamma x \rho \bar{a} \sigma \theta a t$ signifies properly to use any one's co-operation in any thing. The word
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occurs only in the later writers ; the earlier and purer ones using ${ }^{2} \nu \alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$, as Thucyd. in a kindred passage, i. 120. The causes of this reciprocal hatred, and its origin and extent, are fully treated on in Recess. Synop.
10. Tiv $\delta \omega \rho \in \in \dot{d} \tau . \theta$.] i. e. the favour which God graciously vouchsafes to thee, in this opportunity of knowing the Messiah, and having
 properly means running water, as that of fountains and rivers, in opposition to the dead, i. e. stagnant, water of pools or wells. It occurs in Gen. xxvi. 19. and Levit. xiv. 5. The Classical

 this physical sense the woman understood the term. But our Lord employed it figuratively for Yooozoooì. "It was his custom (observes Guin.) from things corporeal to excite the minds of his hearers to the study and knowledge of things spiritual; and from things obvious to the senses (as fields, seed, vines, sheep, light, \&cc.) to deduce copious stores of metaphorical diction. It is common in the Scriptures and the Rabbinical writers to liken unto water that which refreshes and blesses the souls of men. See vii. 38. Prov. x. 11. Ecclus. xv. 3. xxiv. 21.
11. dy т $\lambda \mu a]$ ' a bucket,' such as travellers in the East are accustomed to take with them, and which, by the aid of the rope and wheel provided as fixtures at public wells, was sufficient to procure water from the deepest wells.
12. $\mu$ et' $(\cos )$ ] 'a person of more consequence.' This has reference to what Jesus had before said, "If thou hadst known who it is that speaketh to thee." The words following are meant to say: It was good enough for our ancestor Jacob, who himself drank of it, \&c.; which he would not have done, if he had known a better. If thou canst show us a better, thou wilt in that respect be greater than Jacob. It is well observed by Lame, that as in the East pure water is reckoned among the blessings of life, so he who finds the means of procuring it is justly accounted a public
benefactor. Ol viol, i. e. the family in general, including the servants, as in Gen. xiv. 11. This is agreeable to the simplicity of early times, and which has more or less always prevailed in the East. The mention of the cattle, too, savours of the simplicity of the Oriental and popular manner of speaking.
13, 14. Our Lord here shows that he does not depreciate Jacob or his well; bat intimates that, though great was the benefit bestowed by the Patriarch, he can bestow a far greater one, and thus is superior to Jacob.

- oi $\mu \dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\delta} \psi \dot{\eta} \sigma \boldsymbol{\eta}$ els $\tau \delta \nu$ a.] i. e. shall have nothing more ever to desire. See Revel. vii. 16 . Kuin. thus paraphrases: 'He who has admitted my doctrine, and is imbued with it, will never desire another; since it will exert its salutary efficacy in his mind; will refresh and bless his soul, until the time when he shall obtain perenvial felicity, and that felicity it will secure to him.' To drink, Lampe observes, signifies to fully imbibe Christ's doctrine ; and $\pi \eta \gamma \eta$ and $\alpha \lambda \lambda c \sigma \theta a L$ involve the idea of perennial aboundance. Гevirierat expresses the result of these blessings and this felicity.

15. doss $\mu$ ot \&c. 1 The Commentators are not agreed whether this was spoken in simplicity, or ironically. Both may, in some measure, be admitted.
16. Jesus perceiving that the woman did not yet comprehend him, and moreover began to trifle with him, was pleased at once to check her rising freedom, by reminding her of her immoralities, taking care withal so to effect this as to prove himself a Divinely commissioned Monitor and Teacher.
 motive for this command, when Jesus knew she had no husband, most Commentators trifle eyregiously. There is no shadow of ground to impute simulation to our Lord. The simple truth is (as Titty. suggests) that our Lord bid her do so, as knowing the answer that would thus be returned, which would afford him occasion of showing her
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his omniscience，and admonish her of her immo－ rality．See also Chrys．in Recens．Synop．

17．кa入言s］for $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta \omega \bar{s}$ ，as is plain from the

18．oúx térit $\sigma$ ．$\alpha$ ．］＇is not really，＇or yet thy husband．It appears that the woman had been five times married；but whether those marriages had been dissolved by death or by divorce，does not appear．Both might be the case ；and as divorce was then shamefully prevalent，this implies no certainty of infidelity on the part of the woman， to represent whom as a harlot（which some Commentators do）is quite unjustifiable．Others （and even Tittm．）run into the other extreme， of representing the woman as free from all blame， by supposing that，though not actually married to this person，she was espoused to him．That would require the ou to be taken for oürw； which is a straining of the sense，and is refuted
 implies cohabitation，she cannot be acquitted of living in concubinage，which，however common in the East，and though neither there nor in the West then accounted disgraceful by the multi－ tude，yet was held by persons of any pretensions to virtue as sinful and impure，because trans－ greseing the primeval and sacred institution of matrimony．See Lampe．
 is justly amazed that a stranger Jew should be acquainted with the tenour of her life；for $\pi d \nu \tau a$ may be taken populariter，to denote the leading events of her life；and as marriage is the great business of female life，the woman＇s fortunes in that respect might be called $\pi d \nu \tau a$ ．Such know－ ledge she knew could not be communicated but by Divine revelation；and therefore she justly inferred that Jesus must be at least a prophet， and，as such，be a proper authority to appeal to for the solution of the controverted question as to the comparative holiness of the Jewish and the Samaritan places of common national wor－ ship．To this question our Lord so answers as to give her to understand that it is not necessary to debate it at all，since there was at hand such a total change of religious institutions as to render it nugatory．
 Abraham，Jacob，and their immediate posterity． IIporxuyeiv denotes religious worship of every kind，both prayers and sacrifices，\＆c．
 on which the Samaritans maintained that Abra－ ham and Jacob had erected an altar and offered sacrifices to Jehovah；and therefore that the Deity had willed blessing to be pronounced from
thence．，Hence they called it＂the blessed
 very many MSS．（several of them antient）and some Versions and Fathers，together with the Ed．Princ．and almost all other early Editions，
 almost every Editor from Wets．to Scholz．I cannot，however，venture to admit it，the old reading being superior in external authority，（to which it may be added，that such must have been read by Procopius，as appears from a passage which I have adduced in Recens．Synop．）and I think in internal，for the new reading seems to be（as the character of several of the MSS．which support it would lead us to suppose）a mere cor－ rection of style；though ungrounded；for dv
 sense（namely，＇in this very mountain＇）than d̀ tǜ ofet roúre，which latter is very suitable at v．21．，since there we have no emphasis．Grot． and Lampe notice the custom（probably anti－ diluvial）of worshipping the Deity on moun－ tains，perhaps as being thought nearer to Hea－ ven．
21．Tiorevaóy $\mu 01$ ］Our Lord here claims，at least，the belief due to a Prophet，such as the woman acknowledged him to be．＂E $\rho$ रerat，＂is coming，＇will shortly arrive；namely，at the destruction of Jerusalem．חробкииウ＇बeтe is not for тробкvvíaovat by Hebraism，as some Com－ mentators imagine ；but is a more pointed ex－ pression．Wets．has shown the exact fulfilment of this prediction of the overthrow both of the Jewish and Samaritan holy places，by numerous citations from Josephus and the early Fathers．
 obscurity，which has occasioned some diversity of interpretation．Most Commentators（espe－ cially the antient ones）refer the 8 to the Deity， by the ellips．of $\theta$ eiov，as if the Samaritans knew not God properly by confining Him to place． But this charge，and that of idolatry（which others suppose here alluded to）has been dis－ proved by the researches of Reland，Lampe， and Gesenius，of whom Lampe supposes our Lord to charge them not with corruption，but with ignorance．See Recens．Synop．The recent Commentators from Beng．and Markl．to Kuin． and Tittm．，with more probability，take $\mathbf{z}$ for кaO＇ 8 ，having reference to the manner and form of worship，but also including place；q．d．Ye worship according to your ignorance，we ac－ cording to our knowledge，and by consequence in the manner and place authorized by Divine command．
In the clause following，ärt $\%$ owrnpia－
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＇Iowdaiwn there is a reason suggested why the Jews should beat know the mode and the place of the National worship，namely，since from them the Messiah（owrypia being for $\sigma \omega$ rip）was con－ fessedly to spring．From Christ＇s here number－ ing himself with the Jews，the Socinians infer that he was a mere man；but vainly；for it is plain he here speaks suitably to the character of a prophet such as alone the woman es－ teemed him，and for which he was pleased to pass．
23．¿̀ пгveúm．кal d $\lambda$ ．］I can neither agree with those Commentators who take $\boldsymbol{\pi \nu}$ ．to denote the Holy Spirit；nor with those who take it of the human mind．It should seem that these are
 spiritually and truly，in opposition to the cere－ monial and formal worship of the Mosaic law， the $\lambda d \tau p \in \iota a$ 入oy Our Lord then proceeds to show by two reasoss why God is to be so worshipped．1．From the benign will of the Deity，to whom spiritual and internal worship is alone acceptable；as indeed the Sages of Antiquity had，by the light of reason， discovered．2．From the nature of the Deity， тveûma－dei тporкuyeìv God is of a spiritual nature far removed from any thing corporeal； and therefore he must be worshipped in a spi－ ritual manner．However，тveӥца（as Tittm． suggests）involves also the august nature and perfections of the Deity．
25．The woman here refers the decision of the question to the times of the Messiah，of whose speedy appearance she had probably heard． （Tittm．）The Jews of that age were accus－ tomed to refer the decision of controverted ques－ tions to the coming of future prophets，and especially the Messiah．And from what has been discovered of the opinions of the Sama－ ritans of that age，it should seem that they ex－ pected in the Messiah chiefly a great spiritual guide and teacher of religion．
The most ominent modern Commentators and

Editors are agreed that the clause is 入eүóneyor Xpeatos came from the Evangelist，not the woman．See Campb．and Kuin．＇Avajrenci． The term imports information delivered by mes－ sage from another．
 why Jesus revealed himself so much more unre－ servedly to this woman and the Samaritans than to the Jews，see Recens．Synop．
 simply mean＇hereupon．＇${ }^{0}$ тt $\mu е \tau \alpha$＇$\gamma v y ., ~ ' w i t h ~$ the woman，＇as being a Samaritan．See Recens． Synop．
－Ti Ynreis］A popular expression meaning， ＇what is your purpose or business？＇

28．divөрizocs］for тодítats，by a popular use．IIavta，i．e．by an hyperbole usual to im－ passioned feeling，the main events of her life，on which the rest hinged，namely，her marriages， and her present state of concubinage．
 tators are not agreed whether this means，＇is this the Christ？＇or，＇is not this the Christ？＇ Schleus．remarks，that the interrogation is some－ times an affirmation，sometimes a uegation，and sometimes is merely meant to elicit a reply． Perhaps the last mentioned use may here have place．At least it is difficult to say which of the foregoing uses is to be preferred；probably the former．See Recens．Synop．

31．\＆р由́т $\omega \nu$ ］for жарека́久ouv．
32．Bpcīrıv Exco \＆rc．Here we may recognize our Lord＇s usual endeavour from things corpo－ real to excite the attention of his disciples to things spiritual．With respect to the metaphor in question，Schoettg．observes that in the Scrip－ tural and Rabbinical phraseology，that is said to be one＇s meat and drink，by which one is sup－ ported，refreshed，or delighted．Of this he subjoins several examples from the Rabbinical writers，and others are adduced by Lampe and Wets．from the Classical writers．The drai is emphatic．


















33. ound This is omitted in very many of the best MSS. and some Versions, and is cancelled by almost all the recent Editors.
 is meant (as Tittm. remarks) not merely the work of teaching and reforming men, but every other part of the work of salvation enjoined by the Father. Comp. xviii. 4.
 or $\lambda$ é yovas scil. à日pюzot, as Matth. xvi. 2. In this address to prepare his disciples for what was to take place, and to induce them to imitate his example, our Lord uses three arguments to excite their diligence. 1. That the harvest is near. 2. The fruits to be collected are abundant. 3. The mode of obtaining has been facilitated by others. On the force of revpannyos the Commentators are not agreed. Wets. supposes the metaphor to be derived from corn in the blade, of which nothing certain can be pronounced; and that it is meant to express hope as yet in the bud. As to the particular time mentioned, though there may sometimes be six months between seed time and harvest, yet a Jewish proverb mentions but four; and as seed time and harvest occupy a considerable time, so from the end of seed time to the beginning of harvest there may be about four months. Others, as Grot., Rosenm., and Tittm., think it is unnecessary to press on the sense of tetp., which is used with popular inexactness; and the general sense, they couceive, is: Never mind labour, when the reward is at hand; q.d. As hope calls forth the harvest-man to his work, so be ye also prompt in the accomplishment of the work I commit to you, for the promotion of your own spiritual good and that of others, nay, of the whole human race.

Instead of the common reading tetpapilyón almost all the best MSS. and several Fathers, with the Fi. Princ. and all the carly Fditions, except
the Erasmian, have $\tau \in \tau \rho a \mu \eta \nu o$, which is adopted by every antient Editor from Wets. to Schola, to whose authority and that of MSS., I have deferred; though, after all, the common reading may be the true one; for трínขos occurs in Hebrews xi. 23., and other forms in -os from derivatives of $\mu$ ì occur in the later writers, and probably prevailed in the popular diction.
By deukal is meant a white approaching to yellow, such as accompanies maturity; as $\lambda e u k o ̀ s$ is often used to denote in Greek, like albescere in Latin. By Xwópas are denoted cultivated fields; a signification somewhat rare, but occurring in St. Luke and occasionally in the Classical writers. Under this metaphor is designated the whole human race. See the paraphrase of Kuin. and the Note of Wets., as also Tittm. in Recens. Synop.
 sorts of harvest work. Here we have (as Rosenm. observes) a blending of the apodosis with the comparison. The sense is: As the agriculturist receives his wages for reaping and gathering the corn, so shall ye receive your reward for gathering men unto the kingdom of God; and whether your labour be only preparatory, or finally such as accomplishes the spiritual harvest, ye shall alike be blessed with a reward.'
37. év тоútщ] Sub. трáy $\mu \alpha \tau$, in this case or instance. 'O Xójos, ' saying, proverb.' With the adage following many similar ones are compared by Schoettg. and others.
38. кєкотเа́катє] 'laboured for, worked out.' Koxiâv is used of severe toil, such as is required in all the agricultural occupations which precede harvest. On which see Virg. Georg. i. 121 \& 150 . The application here is obvious. Kómov, i. c. the fruil of labour.
41. $\boldsymbol{i \pi i \sigma \tau c}$ Messiahship.
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42. $\left.\lambda a \lambda / \alpha_{\nu} \nu\right]$ 'narration, testimony.'

- бшттí той кó $\sigma \mu \circ$ ] i. e. not of the Jews only. So much more enlightened, because well disposed, were the Samaritans than the Jews.

44. aürds $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{d}$ 'I.] There is a difficulty involved in the $\gamma \dot{ } \rho$, to remove which various expedients are adopted. The best is, with Schleus., Kuin., and Tittm., to take the $\gamma{ }^{\text {jop }}$ in the sense although.
45. $\left.\beta a \sigma \iota_{i} \lambda_{l x} \delta_{s}\right]$ On the exact sense of this term Commentators are not agreed. It must, I think, denote a courtier, but whether holding any office, or not, or whether a Jew or a foreigner, cannot be determined.
 meant for the bystanders rather than the nobleman, and was directed against the Jews in general. As, however, miracles are the proper evidence of a divine mission, some Commentators think our Lord could not mean the words as a reproof. The sense, they say, is: Except ye see miracles, it cannot be expected that ye will believe, therefore I will heal the courtier's son.' But that is surely straining the sense, and very unnecessarily; for why may we not suppose if $\eta$ тe to be put emphatically, and the words be
meant as a reproof of those who refused belief in the authority of numerous miracles established on the most credible evidence; but demanded to see them with their own eyes. That surely was unreasonable. The proof by miracles could not fairly be demanded to be brought to every individual.
46. To show that he could do even more than the father hoped for, and could heal the sick absent as well as present (and in order thereby to effectually remove the want of faith in the bystanders) Jesus says mopeúov, signifying, 'Go in peace; thy business is done.' Z $\bar{y}$ is by the best Commentators interpreted, ' is well:' So the Heb. $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{M}}$ in Josh. v. 8. and often in the Rabbinical writers. And this signification may very well be accounted for. So the well known "non vivere, sed valere vita!"
 Be入tiótepov or jaóтepov \&c. So the Latin bellè habere and our vulgar idiom "to be bravely." 'Aфท̂кev implies the suddenness of the cure. Similar expressions are cited from Hippocrates.
47. тойто $\left.\pi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda_{\imath} \nu, \& c.\right]$ The sense is, 'This second miracle Jesus worked, after he was
returned,' \&cc., mà $\lambda_{ı \nu}$ being construed with j $\lambda \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\omega}$
V. 1. eoprii] Which of the Feasts this was, the Commentators are not agreed. Some think it was that of Purim in our March, and one month before the Passover. Others suppose it the Enconnia, or feast of eight days, about the middle of December. Others, again, the Feast of Tabernacles. The most eminent Commentators, however, are of opinion that the Passorer is meant, which, though not exempt from difficulty, seems the most probable.
48. d $\pi 1 \pi \bar{j} \pi \rho \circ \beta$.] There is here an ellip. which is variously supplied, by oikce, or dyopă, or x copa, or (which is supposed by the most eminent Commentators as Le Clerc, Wolf, Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm.) $\pi \dot{u} \lambda \eta$. This last is preferable, as being a very frequent ellip. in the best writers from Homer downwards, and is placed beyond doubt by Nehem. iii. 1 \& 32 .
 tıкiv; whereas, on the other hand, there is no evidence of there being any such place as the Sheep-market.
Ko $o \nu \mu \mu \eta_{\eta} \theta \rho a$, signifies properly a sximming or bathing-pool; but here it is supposed by the best Commentators to denote not the pool only, but the buildings which had been erected around and above it, for the accommodation of the bathers. By 'E $\beta$ p. is meant the Syro-Chaldee, then the vernacular tongue in Judza.

- $\mathrm{B} \eta \theta \epsilon \sigma \delta \dot{\alpha}]$ The MSS. vary; but there is not the least reason to doubt the accuracy of the common reading, especially as it is confirmed by the derivation from the Hebr. 'house of mercy, or charity-hospital.' That the bath had medicinal properties, is plain; whence it derived them, is uncertain. The older Commentators refer them to Divine agency; the more recent odes, to natural causes, for which there may be thought some confirmation in the fact, ascertained from Theophyl., that such was a common notion. But as to the causes to which they ascribed it, namely, the effect produced by the washing at this pool of the entrails of the sheep sacrificed at the Temple, or from the blood and washings from the victims being conveyed hither by pipes, which several learned Physiologists think might impart a medicinal property to the water; there is evidence against the former notion; and the latter rests on no proof. Hence the most eminent of the later Commentators account for the effects by supposing that the water was a medicinal one, deriving its sanative properties from some mineral with which it was impregnated. " This would, (says Mead) from the water being perturbed from the bottom by some natural cause, (perhaps subterranean heat, or storms) rise upwards and be mingled with it, and so impart a sanative property to those who bathed in it before the metallic particles had subsided to the bottom. That it should have done so катаं кпเрдข, is not
strange, since Bartholin has, by many examples, shown that it is usual with many medical baths to exert a singular force and sanative power at stated times and at periodical, but uncertain intercals." The learned Physician does not notice the difficulty presented by the words a $\gamma \gamma \mathrm{e}$ -
 Though that might be, with most recent Commentators, referred to the opinion entertained by the Jews, who, ignorant of natural philosophy, referred such phenomena to a peculiar Divine operation, in whose agency they, as usual, called in the intervention of Angels. The Commentators in question, however, so far distrust their own solution with reference to natural causes, that they are inclined to cut out more or less of the text containing this narration. But nothing less will do than cancelling the greater purt of it, namely, the words éedexomèvoy-To üdop. And for that there is only the authority of 4 or 5 MSS., 2 very inferior Versions, and Nonnus. But Nonnus can here be no authority, and such Versions very slight. And the MSS. are such as abound with all sorts of liberties taken with the text. Thus Rinck. (Lucub. Critic. in loco) though a rash Critic, and too apt to innovate on the authority of a few MSS. frankly admits, "Sed suspectæ fidei in ejusmodi omissionibus censores Alexandrini qui, veterum exemplorum auctoritate neglecta, judicio suo nimium indulgentes, quidquid in profanis et Sacris scriptoribus minus aptè vel sapienter dictum videbatur, obelis notare cæperunt." The words, no, doubt, were therein cancelled for the same reason that some Critics of the present day, who bear a strong resemblance to the Alexandrian Censores, wish to get rid of them. The words must, therefore, be retained, and interpreted in their plain and obvious sense, on which see Euthym., Whitby, and Lampe in Recens. Synop. Kuinoel's reasonings are inconclusive, and they create more difficulty than they solve. And as to Doddridge's solution, which combines the common view with that of Mead, \&c., it is, though ingenious, too hypothetical. There is less objection to Bp. Pearce's solution, which supposes the sanative property to have been supernatural, and to have existed only a short period before, as typical of the coming of the Saviour, and at certain irregular intervals; which the Jews ascribed, as they did all the operations of Providence, nay, sometimes of nature, to the agency of Angels.

2. oroas ] The best Commentators, antient and modern, take these to have been porticoss or piazzas fronting the bath, roofed, but open on the sides, and supported with pillars placed at regular intervals; the whole forming a pentagon. This, in so genial a climate as that of Judea, would be a sufficient shelter by day; and at night the patients were probably removed.
3. 'Aoteveiv is applicable to any formod discase; and кaтaкeiofat, to such chronical ones
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as confine any one to his bed or room. 亚npwin seems to denote those labouring under "pining sickness," such as atrophy or consumption.
4. катג кац $\rho \delta \nu$ ] This only means ' at certain intervals of time,' and therefore those who refer it to any stated times, are wrong.
5. ${ }^{\prime \prime} \times \omega \nu$ ] This must be construed with $\eta \nu$, not, as it is done by many, with tptak. ; as appears from v. 6. Comp. Lu. xiii. 11. viii. 43.
 or riodive. Render, 'There was a man there who had been 38 years labouring under sickness.' With respect to the disorder, it was probably paralysis; for not only was such the constant tradition of the primitive ages, but no less than six medical reasons for supposing it, are given by Bartholin.
6. Exec] Sub. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$ dot vela from the preceding.

- $\theta$ E $\lambda e c s$ ] The sense seems to be this: 'Is it your purpose, are you here with the view of being healed?' Thus the answer will be very appropriate.

9. кр $\alpha \beta \beta a \tau o \nu]$ See Mark ii. $4 \& 11$. It seems to have been a small mean seat, something like those portable seats used by us on ship-board, or elsewhere; and had, it appears, only a skin, rug, or the like for a covering. Псрıжатeĩ has reference to his former inability to walk, being bedridden : and the order was given, to evince the completeness of the cure.
10. eidécos db $\gamma \dot{\text { evert }}$ in $\gamma \dot{\eta} \mathrm{i}$ ] Thus from an obstinate and incurable disorder he was immediately restored to health, without that languor which is always observable in those cured by human art. (Tittra.)
11. oi 'Iovoaiot] Not the bystanders, but, (as Lampe has shown) some who met the healed person on his way home carrying his bed.
 xvii. 21., who, however, had reference only to what involved great labour; though the lawyers interpreted the law as forbidding to carry even the lightest weight. Yet the Rabbinical writers recognize some cases, when it was permitted to carry burdens on the Sabbath. If, then, it was lawful for the Lawyers, in certain cases, to dispence with the observance of the Sabbath, how much more for Christ, the Lord of the Sabbath!
12. $\dot{o} \pi o t \eta \sigma a s, 8 c$.] As the Jews admitted that, by the command of a prophet, the Sabbath might be broken, so the man seems to have alluded to this, accounting (as he justly might) the worker of such a miracle to be a Prophet.
 be a signification pragnans, for 'he knew not [and had no opportunity of knowing or ascertaining] who it was, for,"Jesus dॄॄ̇évevaє,' "had glided, or slipt away." 'Eкvéఱ signifies propertly to swim away; and then, like the Latin enatare, and emergere, signifies cvadere, to slip away unobserved. Jesus had done this, we may suppose, out of modesty, partly to avoid the admiration of the well-disposed, and partly to cut off the envy of the malicious.
13. $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \bar{\varphi}$ ie $\rho \bar{\varphi} \overline{]}$ ] A frequent place of resort to the Jews, and whither the healed man had probably gone to return God thanks for his recovers.













 to refer this, with many Commentators, to the Jewish notion, that all violent disorders were the punishment of $\sin$, but we may (with Brag., Grot., and Doddr.) suppose, that the man's disorder had been brought on by internperance and vice, and that our lord meant to give him a proof of his omniscience by showing his knowledge of that fact.
14. 'I $\eta \sigma o \bar{s}$ de $\sigma$ oar] This he, no doubt, collected from circumstances, or from the information of others. There is no reason to suppose (with some Commentators) that his intention in going was a malignant one ; it was rather from a wish to justify himself for breaking the Sabbath by the command of an undoubted prophet; as also from open-hearted gratitude to his beefactor, and out of benevolence to others, by making known the fountain of health. By' coir 'Iovoiatos may be meant the influential persons among the Jews, i.e. the Sanhedrim and leading Doctors and Jurists, or (as Tittm. supposes) those Jews whom he met with, as ver. 10 .
15. dжexpiyato] As an ansuer implies a question, Grot., Lampe, and others suppose the following a justification of his conduct pronounced by Jesus before the Rulers at cither a public or private examination. No previous questions, however, are necessary to be supposed; but we may take $\dot{\alpha}$ кєкрivato for dime-
 Lord, it seems, intended to rebut their calumny by thus addressing them, while standing by at the temple. The words of his justification are obscure from brevity; and for this, and their abruptness, the best Commentators suppose that the Evangelist has not recorded the whole of what was then said. But there is something so precarious in that principle, that it should never be resorted to unless in a case of necessity; which does not exist here. It should seem that our Lord comprehended all that was necessary in this brief, but pithy, dictum, in order to make the more impression on those whom be addressed; it being customary with the Jews to express things, as much as possible, in the apothegmatical manner. Besides, it is not so obscure but that the Jews really comprebenterl
the most material part, i.e. his claiming to be Son of God, and consequently equal with Good; from which his right to overlook the Sabbath would, by the authority even of the Jewish traditions, be undoubted. By $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \boldsymbol{y}^{\prime} \zeta \in \sigma \theta a t$ is meant the operation of God, as shown in the preservation and governance of all created beings, and therefore the works of His omnipotence; and by $\ddot{\epsilon} \omega s \tilde{a} \rho \tau 1$ is expressed the perpetuity of that preservation and governance, or the watchfut care of God, unremittingly exerted for the safety and welfare of his creatures. He hints, too, that God can require no Sabbath, or rest. By this example of God, Jesus intends to rebut their crimination, and to teach them that he imitates God, who hath no Sabbath, but doth His work perpetually. "As my Father doth not cease to benefit men on the Sabbath, neither am I impeded by any such observance." But, what is more, our Lord professes to do the same works which the Father doth; and these not only of benevolence, but of omnipotence. He therefore equals himself with the father. And when the Jews, as was natural, understood this of claiming equality with God, Jesus did not attempt to remove that notion, but confirmed and more expressly asserted it.
16. oi divucat, \&c.] To this charge of the Jews, that he claimed equality with God, by professing to have power, by his own authority, to dispense with the observance of the Sabbath, Jesus replies by explaining more fully what he had before said. The justification which follows was, as appears from v. 18., pronounced some little time after the preceding. In this verse our Lord professes, that he doth nothing of his own will, but in conformity with that of the Father, and that therefore his works are consentaneous to those of the Father; nay, that there is the same will both of Father and Son, as also the same power. That he doth all things after the example of the Father, and therefore can do nothing contrary to His will; in short, that he cannot depart from the example of the Father, either in doing, or not doing any thing; there being a comparison of the works of the Father with those of the Son, in universality, idemtity, and conjunction of will and plan. (Tittm.)




$\times$ Matt． 11 ． x Matt． 12.
17. 

et 88.18 supr．3．35． infrijo dédur yap ．y．y







 Gal．2． 90. b Dan．12． ${ }_{1}^{2}$. ${ }_{52}{ }^{5}$ ． 52.
16.
16.




20．$\left.\pi a^{\prime} \nu \tau a-\pi o c e i\right]$ Here there is a comparison from what takes place between a worthy father and a dutiful son；and the whole is expressed po－ pulariter．By the $\mu \in i$ ova are meant those which he should do after his second advent，namely， raising the dead，and holding final and irrever－ sible judgment；illustrious tokens of equality with the Godhead．
21．The portion from v． $21-30$ ．has been in all ages variously explained．Many take the passages allegorically and mystically，referring what is there said of the resurrection and jug－ ment to Jewish opinions．By others it has been thought that there is a two－fold interpretation of the passage，one tropical and mystical，the other literal and historical．The question，however，is， what our Lord meant to be understood by the resurrection of the dead，and judgment here men－ toned，whether the resuscitation of the men of his time to a spiritual and moral life，or the re－ surrection of all to eternal life，and whether by judgment he meant the retribution to succeed this．These two interpretations are discussed by Titty．ap．Recens．Synop．，who，with the best Commentators，determines in favour of the latter， which I have no doubt was primarily intended； but it is not impossible that our Lord might mean to include，in a secondary application，the mys－ tical sense，which Tittm．admits to be permitted by the context，and the usage of language；nay this would seem occasionally to be the predo－ minant one．

24．els крíбıv oúk ëpхетаi］i．e．，as Chrys． explains，on ко入a＇豸етая．But experat is for d $\lambda$ ev́धєтal，to show the certainty of the event．
－метаßé $\beta \eta \kappa \in \nu$－acorn $\nu$ ］These words will yield a good sense，on either of the above－men－ toned interpretations，according to the latter of which they will signify，＇he passeth，（Preterite for Present）or he will pass，is to pass（on both which see Win．Gr．）from death to a state of everlasting life and happiness，＇the Present being used to express the certainty of the thing．

of conferring life，is the fountain of life and hap－ piness．This verse shows the reciprocity of the perfections and attributes of both the Father and the Son．

27．крiб亢v moteì］＇to hold judgment．＇ －ört vide $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\pi} \boldsymbol{*}$ eu．］Many eminent Commentators from Beza downwards take the sense to be，＇although，＇or＇inasmuch as he is a son of man．＇An interpretation ably，but not， 1 think，convincingly，maintained by Le Clerc， Wets．，Schoettg．and Campo．，who refer to Hear．iv．15．sq．Dan．vii．13．I see no reason to abandon the common interpretation，supported by almost all the antient and most modern Com－ mentators，including Morus，Rosenm．，Kun．， and Titty．；by which vies $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \cos ^{\prime}$ on is for ： yids rout dutpwimou，the Messiah，as vide $\Theta \in o u$ is for $\dot{o}$ viols tout $\Theta c o u ̂ ~ i n ~ M a t t h . ~ x i v . ~ 33 . ~ L u . ~ i . ~ 35 . ~$ and elsewhere．Of the same opinion，I perceive， is Bp．Middlet．，the substance of whose annota－
 already occurred 70 times，and now for the first time without either of the Articles，from which Beza and others contend that the sense is＇son of a man．＇They attempt to defend this on a Syriasm，which is rather against their conclusion． The omission of the Articles must be explained from Greek usage．Now the Articles in the phrase $\dot{\delta}$ viols tout $\alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \dot{\pi}$ on were employed， because Christ assumed to himself this appella－ cion，and the very assumption forbade him to use the phrase otherwise than as $\delta$ vids roil du0paj－ nov．And the first Article requires the second， for $\delta$ vide d d 0 pétrou would offend against re－ gimen．Hence the Article is not materially and essentially necessary，but only accidentally；and consequently it will not be admitted but when regimen requires it，i．e．when $\dot{\delta}$ viols precedes． Now here not $\dot{o}$ vide，but vide follows eccl，and the phrase could not be otherwise than ios dy－ $\theta \rho \boldsymbol{\sigma} \pi о$ ．The Fathers in similar cases use the phrase vide $d \nu \theta \rho .$, i．e．where the Canons require vide to be without the Article．Moreover，the sense for which these Commentators contend is


















equally deducible from the common interprets－ Lion；for the title Son of man has everywhere reference to the incarnation of Christ，and there－ fore implies His acquaintance with human in－ firmity．Indeed，in most places where Christ calls himself the Son of man，the allusion is either to his present humiliation，or to his future glory．And thus we have a strong declaration， that the human nature did not originally belong to Him，and was not properly his own．＇

30．oi dívapal－ovióév］Dúvapat and az＇ imautoü are to be taken as at v．19．；only what is there said of any action，is here applicable to judicial ones．（Euthym．）Thus what is done by Christ is understood to be done with the full concurrence of the Father．
－каӨais dкаи́ш，крivco］Render：＇As I hear I am to judge and pass sentence．＇Kab，＇and
 Qc．suggest another reason why his judgment is just，because he is not biassed by any private passion or humour，as human judges sometimes are，but regards alone his Father＇s will．

31．dar d $\boldsymbol{\omega}^{\infty}$ цартир末 \＆c．］To obviate an objection，which is couched in a proverbial say－ ing expressing，that no one is a fit witness in his own cause，（ of which many examples are adduced by Wets．），Jesus proceeds to show that from his actions，miracles，and the character of his doc－ trines，he is proved to be the Messiah．There is an slip．of $\mu$ óvos；and $d^{\prime} \lambda \eta \theta \eta \dot{r}$ is for toto， valid．

32．ai dos］Who is here meant，the Commen－ taters are not agreed．The antient and early modern ones suppose John the Baptist ；but the more recent ones，the Father．There is much to be said in support of the latter interpretation； （see Lampe and Guin．）but the former is strongly countenanced by the next verse．

33．$\dot{u} \mu \mathrm{eis}-\alpha \lambda \eta \theta$ cia］i．e．You yourselves have heard the witness appealed to by a public mis－
sion，and who bore testimony concerning us． You have therefore human testimony．See i． 8. 3 Job．3， 6.

34．ed raj de out \＆cc．］The sense is ：＇I say not this through a desire for the honour which human fame can bestow．I want－I accept not the tex－ timony of any man．I only appeal to the test－ mong of John，in order that，believing，in me through that testimony，ye may be saved．＇A $\lambda \lambda \alpha$ ， imo．
35．$\delta$ 入úxvos $\dot{\delta}$ кatónevos］Camp．and Min－ diet．remark，that this expresses more than a burning and shining light．＂John＇s ministry （says the former）was of a peculiar character； he was the single prophet in whom the old Dis－ pensation had its completion，and by whom the new was introduced ；therefore，until our Lord＇s ministry took place，John may justly be said to have been the light of that generation．＂Middlet． thinks there is an allusion to some phrase then current to signify an enlightened teacher．This is confirmed not only by what Lights．says，that ＂a person famous for light or knowledge was called a candle，the candle of the Law，the lamp of light；＂but by a passage of Sal．Jarchi cited by Lampe，and，what is more，by Ecclus．xlviii．1． Nor is the metaphor unknown in the Classical writers．
－ajar $a \lambda \lambda \iota a \sigma \theta \bar{j} v a \iota]$ Most recent Editors adopt， from several MSS．，dya入入ıa日̄̄vat，as being the more difficult reading．But that principle does not apply in cases like this，where the difference is so very small．The $\sigma$ would easily be omitted by a confusion of the mark of abbreviation 9 with 3 ．
36．Our Lord now suggests the reason why he needs not the testimony of John，and that by adducing the infinitely weightier one of the Father，appealing to the works the Father hath enabled him to accomplish，and adverting to the testimony of the Prophets of the O．T．On this
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use of the Article ( $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ ) see Middlet. G.A.i.8.1. and Win. Gr. p. 171.
37. ойтє фшעทㄴ-єшра́катє] The best mode of taking these words is to regard them, with Markl., as an objection of the Jews, but uttered by our Lord in his own person. "Ye will say that ye have never heard his voice, nor seen his shape ; true-but \&c." This manner of speaking, he shows, is common in the Classical writers, May there not, however, be an ellip. of кaimes? That being supposed would make ali right. The sense may be thus expressed: 'Although ye have never seen God in a visible form bearing this testimony of me, yet he has given it in the Scriptures and by other testimonies of his mission. By rejecting one to whom such dinible testimony was borne ye show that ye have not the Scriptures at heart.'
 bated whether épeuyaue ought to be taken as an Imperative, or as an Indicative. The former method is adopted by almost all the antient and most of the modern Commentators; the latter, by nearly all the most eminent modern ones; and with reason; for the Indic. is far more agreeable to the context; nor are the objections which have been advanced against it of any weight; while, on the other hand, the Imper. involves a great harshness in the dokeite just after. That the Jews did use even painfully diligent investigation and study of the Scriptures, is certain from the antient Rabbinical writings. Our Lord grants that they did this, and, by implication, commends them for it; but complains, that this has not its effect in bringing them to acknowledge him as their Saviour, and thus to obtain salvation.
The words каi éкєivat-ímoū are meant to give another reason for the diligent study of Scripture, namely, in order to comprehend the predictions of the Messiah.
I must not omit to observe that the usual interpretation of doкeire, ' ye think, (as ye justly may).' seems an unjustifiable straining of the
sense. I cannot venture to pronounce the sense to be more than, ' Ye think, or suppose.'
40. кal] 'and (yet.)' 'Eג日ein $\pi \rho d s$ X. is 2 phrase occurring aleo at vi. $35,37,44,45$. vii. 37. x. 41. xiv. 6 . which signifies to resort to Jesss and accept him as a Teacher and Saviour. Oí $\theta \in \lambda \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ implies that their want of faith in him is the result not of simple ignorance, but of wiffal obstinacy.
41. Our Lord means to eay that he does not 80 speak as though he needs their textimony or sanction, but solely to warn them of the awful error in which they were. On this He (at v. 42.) engrafts another sentence containing the reason why they would not receive him as Messiah, because they had not the love of God, the first and great principle of religion, in their bearts.
43. This v . is, I conceive, a further unfolding of the sentiment at $v .41$. And the sense is: 'I need not human glory, because I came unto you with Divine authority. Yet, so perverse are ye, that if another should come with only his own (i.e. human) authority, him ye will admit.'
44. This $v$. suggests the renson for this preference, namely, ambition, vain-glory, worldlymindedness. The $\pi \bar{\omega} s$ súvagoe (as lampe remarks) implies that the origin of this inability was perversity of will, and such hardness of heart, that they would not come unto Christ.
45. The sense is: 'Although ye despise and reject me, yet think not (measuring my disposition by your own) that I am your cenemy, and desire your condemnation. This is neither my wish por aim ; nay it is rather your saleation that I desire, and therefore ye need not suppose that I shall be your accuser unto God.' (Kuin.)
By Moses is meant the doctrine, or Books of Moses, and the other Prophets. 'H

46. Tepl émoü é $\gamma \rho a \psi e \nu]$ i. e. not only showed by what marks a Divise legate might be distinguished from a false prophet, (see Deut. xviii. 15. seqq.) but predicted the coming of the author of a better religion.
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 (Lampe.)
 discrepancy with the other Evangelists, the best modern Commentators take the sense to be, 'they willingly received,' which I have in Recens. Syn. confirmed from several passages of the Classical writers.
22. $\dot{\delta}$ ' $\sigma \tau \eta \kappa \omega i s]$ i. e. who had remained there, for the purpose, no doubt, of deliberating, whether they should proclaim Jesus as Messiah.
26. Our Lord, observing that the multitude which flocked to him were influenced not by a desire for spiritual improvement, but worldly advantage, takes occasion from the natural and earthly bread with which he had supplied them, to advert to spiritual and celestial nutriment; and he enters into a discourse with the bystanders, showing how much more anxious they ought to be for the acquisition of spiritual than of natural nourishment. The Commentators complain of the obscurity of this passage, which, I agree with them, is to be ascribed to the figurative mode of expression adopted, and perhaps to the Evangelist's having given the substance rather than the very words, and that expressed with extreme brevity. But I see no reason to suppose (as some do) that the difficulty has been occasioned by the omission of any part of the discourse.
 often in the Classical writers, denotes together
with labour its effect in gain or acquirement. The sense, then, is : 'labour to acquire.' 'Amo $\lambda \lambda$. denotes what terminates merely in animal life. The metaphor in $\beta \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ 并关ovoav is such as is common in all languages. The $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$ is by most recent Commentators rendered non tam-quàm. But that principle in oű- $\alpha \lambda \lambda a$ and $\mu \dot{\eta}-\dot{d} \lambda \lambda a$ has been recently disputed by De Wette, Schulthess, and Winer, Gr. p. 159.; and indeed with some reason, especially as concerns $\mu \dot{\eta}-\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$.
 commissioned, as it were with a seal, as contracts and orders were sealed. This is perhaps all that the allusion imports; though some think that there is a reference to the custom of sealing victims for sacrifice, or branding slaves, to denote property in them.
28. Here they ask how they may obtain these benefits, or gain the approbation of God. By $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ef $\rho$ y is meant the actions which are enjoined by God, as Ps. li. 19. the sacrifices of God.
30. Some of the most eminent Commentators are of opinion that the persons addressing Christ in this conversation are not to be considered the same throughout. This, indeed, seems to offer the best mode of solving many difficulties connected with the present discourse; though it is by Kuin. and others pushed too far. The best and safest view may be as follows. Those who address Him at $\mathbf{v}$. 26 . and propose the question at v. 28. could not need to seek a sign in proof of
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his Messiahship, as the persons do at v. 30 .; for they had themselves very recently beheld a most illustrious one, which occasioned them to declare Jesus to be the Messiah. They were probably the chief Jews of the synagogue, and, though they had, no doubt, heard of the last miracle Jesus had worked, and of many others in Galilee, yet wished to sec one, Ti rozeis où onpeĩov, iva io on $\mu \in \nu$. In fact, in calling for a sign, and adverting to Moses calling down manna from heaven, they seem to have desired, what was by the Jews of that time regarded as the only anequivocal proof of Divine mission, a sign from heaven, (such as the calling down manna) something not private, simple, and unostentatious, but public, conspicuous, and striking the senses. Thus at Matt. xvi. and Mark viii. they demand a sign from heaven.
31. Td $\mu \dot{\alpha} \nu \nu a]$ The Article here, omitted in most English Versions, should be expressed. On the derivation of the word the Commentators are not agreed; whether from the Heb. ni what is this? מנה to measure, or prepare. Most recent Commentators and Lexicographers enlarge much in describing the common manna, which still bedews the ground in the East, and is collected in the morning and made into a kind of cake; the best account of which is that of Burckhardt in his Travels in Syria. The identity, however, of this with the Manna of the Israelite, though supposed (indeed taken for granted) by those Commentators, remains to be proved. But there are so many important diversities between the two, pointed out by Deyling in his Ubs. S. iii. 7. as completely to establish the miraculous nature of the transaction with those who admit the credibility of Moses. It was called " bread from heaven," bread-because made up into cakes like the natural manna, and from heaven, as being the gift of God.
 - That was not really bread from heaven, but from the sky, which Moses gave you. The true bread from heaven is what the Father is now giving you:' "Our Lord's declaration (says Campb.) imports that it is in a subordinate sense only that what dropped from the clouds, and was sent for the nourishment of the body, still mortal, could be called the bread of heaven,
being but a type of that which hath descended from the heaven of heavens, for nourishing the immortal soul unto eternal life, and which is therefore, in the most sublime sense, the bread of heucen." "Our Lord means (says Tittm.) that there is as much difference between the food supplied by Moses, and that which his Father would bestow, as between the body and the soul, between temporal and eternal life, earth and heaven."
 plantation, shows what sort of bread he means, even himself, as the author of that Heavenly doctrine which nourishes the soul, and at the same time leads unto salvation, adverted to in the
 the great doctrine of the Atonement, by which life was given to a world dead in trespasses and sins.
34. The multitude (for it seems to have been the common people, who said this, and not the persons who harl demanded a sign) mistook the words of our Lord, as if os катaßainasy referred to ajpros.
35. é $\gamma \omega^{\circ}$ cine \&c.]. Our Lord now speaks plainly. The sense is: 'It is I who am that bread of life, as being the procurer and bestower of it ; for whosoever becomes my disciple and embraces my doctrine, shall have no desire for any thing further, having all that is necessary to happiness and salvation: Observe the arallelism, in which $\dot{o} d \mu x^{\prime} \mu e v o s ~ \pi \rho o ́ s ~ \mu \epsilon ~ i n ~ t h e ~$ former member is explained by io rafotcúcevels $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{c}$ in the latter.
36. $\alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ єітои-птьтте́етє] There is here some obscurity, occasioned by brevity. The best Commentators render thus: 'But, as I have told you before, ye see and know me, yet ye believe not on me.' The nature of the sentence and its meaning may, however, be better explained as follows: • But, as I have already told you [and now tell you again ], (Compare Philip. iii. 18.) ye have seen me [and my works, and known my doctrines] and yet ye believe not on me.'
 to be: Yet I shall not labour in vain, there will not be wanting those who shall receive my doctrine. It is plain that by way is meant тávtos: but it is not easy to determine the
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sense of the Father giving men to Christ, which, as it is natural, has been drawn by the Calvinists into a support of their system; but wholly without reason. See the Notes of Grot., Hamm., and Whitby, and the 12th of Dr.S. Clarke's 17 Sermons. To suppose, indeed, such a doctrine, however true, to be promulgated at this time and under these circumstances, would be quite preposterous. It is justly remarked by Mr. Horne, that the scope of the whole passage is to show that Christ rejects none who truly repent and unfeignedly believe in him.
38. ӧть катаßє́ $\beta \boldsymbol{\eta \kappa \alpha}$ \&c.] The connexion seems to be: "And this independently of my wish; for I came down, \&c., i. e. for the very purpose of my coming down on earth was, \&c. How should I repel any who thus come unto me, since I came for the very purpose of bringing them to salvation."
39. ${ }^{\text {é }} \boldsymbol{\xi}$ aúroū]. scil. $\pi$ ávтos. Sub. $\tau \iota$, as at xvi. 17. Apoc. xi. 9. and elsewhere. M $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi \boldsymbol{r}$ $\lambda$ d $\sigma \infty$, ' that I should as far as depends on me, suffer no one to perish.' The verb is taken permissively. By dyaoriow (at which repeat lva, and take dvaor. in the Subjunctive) is meant (as almost always in Scripture as well as the Rabbinical writers) the resurrection of the blessed to eternal happiness.
40. This v . is a plainer expression of the preceding sentiment. Occopw denotes attentive observation, as necessary to knowledge and conviction.
41. غं $\gamma \dot{o} \gamma \gamma v \zeta_{o v}$ ] The word imports not only secret discontent, but indignant though low complaint.
44. $\dot{\epsilon} \lambda \kappa u ́ \sigma n a \dot{v} \tau \dot{\partial} \nu]$ It is now admitted by all enlightened Expositors that èncúcos here, like
the Hebr. משׁך, expresses a force not physical, but moral, and that not compulsory, but denoting ' to draw any one to, to bend, or sway, either the understanding to assent, or the will to obedience. by all moral means and fit motives;' and that not only by doctrine and instruction, but also by benefits. See Joh. xii. 32. Jer. xxxi. 3. Hos. xi. 4 . That this and other similar verbs, as avaүкá\}ecy, ßıá̧ecoa i, \&c. are often so used by the Classical writers, is proved by Grot., Lampe, and Wets. Chrysost. warmly encounters those views which are supported from this passage by the Calvinists, and which he ascribes to the Manichaans.
Before $\tau \bar{\eta} \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \chi$. many MSS. insert $\varepsilon^{\prime} \nu$, which is received by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. But I suspect that it arose from the oy preceding, or came from the margin.
45. кal éfoyтat \&c.]. Meaning that these words (taken from Is. liv. 13.) shall be made good. By rois mpoфýrats is meant (by an idiom common in Jewish citation) in that part of the Sacred Volume called the Prophets. At$\delta a \kappa \tau o l$ is for $\delta \in \delta \iota \delta a \gamma \mu \in ́ v o c$, and there is an ellip. of $\dot{\boldsymbol{v} \pi \delta ́}$. See Win. Gr. Gr. § 23. 3. 6. Toü before $\theta_{s} 0 \hat{v}$ is omitted in many antient MSS. and Fathers, and is cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz.
 presses the sense thus: "What I have said of the teaching of the Father is not to be understood of complete and immediate instruction : this hath fallen to the lot of Him only, who came down from Heaven, who was sent from the Father, or who hath been with him (i.e. to me,) and who hath obtained a full knowledge of God and of his will, as being most familiarly and intimately conjoined with the Father."
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47, 48.] Here our Lord, to make himself thoroughly understood, repeats what he had before said, that he is (i.e. imparts) the food of life, and that whosoever hath faith in him shall have everlasting life.
49, 50 . The scope of these $\mathbf{v v}$. is to illustrate what has been said, by showing, on comparison, the superiority of the spiritual bread which Christ bestows, to the corporeal bread procured by Moses. We may render: - Your forefathers ate the manna in the wilderness, and yet died : that is the bread [of life] which descended from heaven, in order that if any eat thereof, he may not die ;' or, ' the 'bread which came down from heaven, that is the bread [of life].' The phrase фayeiv $\bar{\epsilon} \xi$ a $\rho$ тои denotes to avail themselves of that doctrine, by coming to Jesus, having faith in him, \&c.
51. Here our Lord fully declares, in literal expressions, what he had, in the preceding verse, couched in figurative ones. By $\zeta_{\omega} \omega \nu$ is meant Coosocoiv, denoting (as Tittm. remarks) that he is the author of life, having obtained the power of bestowing it by his death. This is illustrated by the words following, which may be rendered: - And this bread, moreover, which I shall give (i.e. the cause of it) is my flesh, which I shall give for the salvation of the world;' where there is plainly a reference to the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and the atonement through his blood. The kal-de indicates a new illustration by transition. Compare Acts iii. 24. Joh. viii. 16. sq. Many Interpreters antient and modern think the words have reference to the Eucharist; but not a few eminent Fathers and the most recent modern Commentators, especially Lampe, Titm., and Ruin., prove that that is an utterly unfounded notion.
52. ¿дд⿱㇒́хоуто] 'altercabant.'
 that those whom he addressed needed not so much comprehension, as candour, was pleased not to enter into any further explanation, but gravely repeated, with stronger asseveration, what he had before said. By his flesh and blood he here does not mean (as many recent Commentators imagine) his doctrine; as is completely proved by Lampe and Tittm. He, doult,les:, by flesh and blood meant his violent and bloody death. See Wets. in Recons. Synop. By eating his flesh and drinking his blood. Tittm. thinks, is meant believing in his death, and that determinutely. It should rather seem that the expressons signify availing ourselves of the sacrifice of his death, by coming unto Him in faith, and thus using the means of salvation held out to us.

54,50 . These $\mathbf{v v}$. further illustrate what preceded. The best Theologians are agreed that our Lord has no reference to the Eucharist. See Titer. and Doddr. in Recens. Synop. Yet (as I have there observed) there may be an allusion to it, by a prophetical intimation of the advantakes to be derived from its participation.
56. $\dot{d} \nu \dot{d} \mu o l-a \dot{u} \tau \bar{\omega}]$ i. e. there is an intimate union and reciprocal love of Christ, who remains in any one by loving, aiding, defending, delivering, and blessing him, both here and hereafter. The disciple remains in Christ by receiving him, and continuing to account him as the author of his salvation, \&c. (Titty.)
57. каӨ்ं' $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon i \lambda \dot{c}]$ The best Commontaters here suppose an enallage, and take the sense to be : 'As the Father liveth who sent me.' No doubt, the force of the antithesis is in $\zeta \bar{\omega} \nu$, not $d \pi \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \epsilon i \lambda \epsilon$. By liveth, says Titty., is meant hath life in himself. $\Delta ı \dot{\alpha} \tau \delta \nu \pi a \tau \dot{\rho} \rho$ is generally interpreted, ' by means of the Father.' But J. A. H. Tittmann de Synod. p. 241), is per*
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haps right in saying that $\delta$ ta' here denotes not so much the efficient cause as the end of action-that " in quo ratio vita querenda sit."
60. $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \bar{\omega} \nu]$ Some take this to mean the Apostles; others, the LXX.; others, again, the disciples at large.

- $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o s$ ] Some explain this 'hard to be understood;' others, ' ungrateful, offensive,' which interpretation is adopted and illustrated by the best Commentators.

62. є $\alpha \dot{\nu}$ oũ $\nu$ yew $\bar{\eta} \tau \in \& i c$.] The apodosis here is omitted by an ellis. common in all languages, from strong emotion in the speaker. At the end of the v. supply $\tau 1$ épeite; What? if you shall see; q. d. When ye see me return to heaven, my original dwelling-place, as the Logos with God, (see i. 1.) what will ye then say? Ye will abandon your error.
63. Td $\pi \nu \in \bar{u} \mu a]$ Some explain $\tau \delta \pi \nu$. the spiritual sense, as opposed to the literal. Others, that exalted and spiritual mode of thinking which Christ's doctrines produced, above the grovelling ones held by the Jews. The usus loquendi is rather in favour of the latter; but the former is more agreeable to the context, and is preferable, as including the latter. It is, moreover, confirmed by other parts of Scripture. Thus in 2 Cor. iii. 6. $\pi \nu \in \dot{v} \mu a$ is opposed to $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a$. For, to use the words of Bp. Middlet., " as in an andmated substance there are the flesh and the animating principle, so in the Levitical law there was the letter, which was intelligible to the most carnal understandings, and the spirit or ulterior design of the Institution, which for the
most part eluded notice : and, by an easy metaphor, in speaking of any system or body of instruction, the terms spirit and flesh may be substituted for spirit and letter. Suppose our Saviour, therefore, to say: Does this then stagger you? How much more would ye be surprised, if ye were to witness my ascension? But it is the spiritual part of religion, which is of avail in opening the understanding: my words, however, are the spirit and life of all, which ye have hitherto known only in the literal and carnal sense."
64. oúdels dúvatal- de do principle may be applied to the exposition of this verse as to that employed at vv. $37 \& 44$., where see Notes. 'Es here signifies ' on the part of:' and is for rap ai or $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta^{\prime}$. Our Lord means to suggest a reason for their tergiversation.
 дтíac is explained by oúкétı $\mu \in \boldsymbol{c}^{\prime}$ aútoû $\pi \epsilon$ pıєтázov̀. The latter is a Hebrew phrase to denote discipleship; as Prov. xiii. 20. The former metaphor is common in the Classical writers.
65. $\mu \dot{\eta}$ cal $\dot{\mathbf{v}} \mu \mathrm{eis}$ ] This is by Hoogev. given as an example of the reproachful sense of $\mu \dot{\eta}$, 'What, will ye also go away?' But that force is in the context rather than in the particle. From the passages of the Classical writers adduced in Recens. Synop. from Wets. and others, it appears that this mode of address was not unfrequently resorted to by monarchs, generals, and philosophers, when likely to be abandoned by their adherents.
66. $\dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime \mu} \mu \tau \alpha$ ] 'the doctrines.' "EXes, 'since
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thou hast them,' and consequently no other can have them. The $\sigma 0$ in the next verse is emphatical. 'O Xp., Not that Christ, but the Christ.
 as some of the best Commentators and Editors have seen, terminates at $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \in \lambda .$, not at $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau L \nu$; for the sal is, as Euthym. observes, put for cal $\ddot{\sigma} \mu \mathrm{cos}$. The sense is: Have 1 not chosen [and appointed] you as the twelve [apostles]?' Choice for an office implies appointment. Hence the sense in question is found in the best Classical writers, and occurs in Acts xiii. 17. $\Delta t a \beta b o h o ́ s \dot{\varepsilon}$. Not, is a devil, as is Satan, i.e. like Satan; for the best Commentators are agreed that there is no authority for that rendering. The sense is, undoubtedly, an adversary, one disaffected to me.
 hostile to, is used in the best Classical writers. See my Note on Thucyd. viii. 83. No. 1.
67. èere] innuit, he meant. This sense is frequent both in the Classical writers and the N. T. See Valckn. on Herodot, vii. 144. There is no occasion to suppose, with some, an clip. of $\pi$ то́s.
VII. 1. тepıeтá tet] resided. This sense occurs also at xi. 54. and Revel. ii. 1 ., and is said to be formed on the use of the Heb. הלך; though Black. maintains, I think without sufficient reason, that it occurs also in the Classical writens. Here, however, the term seems to imply not a continued abode at any one place, but peregrination. Oìк $\eta \theta_{e} \lambda \epsilon \nu$ is wrongly interprated by some Commentators for oui yidóvato, since it simply means 'was not disposed, did not chase.'
68. ot dide入фol] " brethren, or kinsmen.' See Note on Matt. xii. 46. \& xiii. 55.

- oi $\mu a \theta \eta r a l]$ Sub. éкєi, 'thy disciples there [as well as here];' namely, as the Commentators suppose, the disciples whom Jesus had made in the first year of his ministry. On the motive with which this advice was offered, see Recens. Synop. The favourable as well as the
unfavourable view has been pushed too far. They probably imagined Jesus to be a Prophet indeed, considering the miracles they had beheld, they could not suppose less-but had no notion that he was the Messiah. They, however, conceived Him to be very much actuated by worldly motives; and as they looked to personal advantage from his celebrity, they, on finding many disciples in Galilee abandoning him, coungelled him to go to Judea, and confirm the attachment of his faithful followers there, and endeavour to increase their number.
 here is clearer than the construction. Some take the sal for ös. Others, for $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \alpha^{\alpha}$. According to the latter method, it will be a gnome, that all men have such a desire for glory as to aim at obtaining celebrity for their illustrious deeds. And we may render: 'For no one doth any thing considerable in secret, but is desirous of coming into public notice.' The former constriction may be admitted; but the latter yields the preferable sense. Tl here, as often, denotes something great. The phrase Ex ma $\rho \dot{\rho} \eta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{a}$ occurs also at xi. 54. and Col. ii. 15. and in Philo cited by Abresch. Hoceīs may mean, 'if thou art doing, art engaged in these things,' these great designs.
 time of my death,' as some Commentators take it; but, as others, including Wolf, Rosenm., Kin., and Tittm., 'the time of my going up to the feast at Jerusalem, and manifesting myself
 Mos form a sort of acute dictum, perhaps proverbial, signifying, "Any time and manner will be suitable for you to go there; you have no cause for fear." The reason is hinted rather than expressed in the verse following, where is changed into a general assertion the natural form of expression "I cannot go thus publicly from that hatred of the multitude which has been incurred by a free reproof of their vices:; but they have no such cause to hate you.;
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Oí dóvatal, cannot, in the natural course of things.
8. oüт $\alpha \nu \alpha \beta a i \nu \omega]$ The most eminent Commentators and Editons are agreed in reading, for oürw, ouv; but on grounds which seem little solid. The external evidence for oú is only that of four MSS. and some inferior Versions. But the authority of Versions is, in a case like the present, of no great weight ; and the number of MSS. (themselves not of the best credit) is too small to be entitled to much attention. And therefore it can only be regarded as an inadvertent alteration; which is far more probable than that all the other MSS. and antient Versions should contain a gloss. Besides, oík cannot be defended in the usual sense; and that of ov̂̃ $\omega$, which the Commentators inculcate, is not very well founded, and here could scarcely be supposed to have place without compromising our Lord's ingenuousness. The sense of oünc $\dot{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \boldsymbol{\nu} a \beta a i v e=$ (by an idiom found also in our own language) is: ' It is not my intention at present to go up,' \&c. The next words, which hint at rather than express his meaning, signify: 'My time for going is not fully come,' or at hand.
 'as if incog.;' travelling, no doubt, by the by-roads.
11. oi 'I. ésjंтouv' The best Commentators take the sense to be, the principal persons among the Jews, the chief Priests, \&c. sought him, to put him to death.' This is countenanced by v. $1,19 \& 25$; but the words following demand the sense 'Judxi desiderant eum ;' a signification frequent in the N. T., especially St. John's writings.
12. yor $\chi^{v o \mu} \mu \mathrm{~d}$ ] The term has here the sense in which Gpous is often used in Thucyd. and other writers, namely, a muttering or whispering, and, in a general way, private discourse. 'A ${ }^{2} \alpha \theta \delta_{s}$ must be taken simply in the sense vir bonus, as in Cicero's Vir bonus est quis? \&c.
13. ovidelc] i.e. no man [of those who thought favourably of him].

- $\delta \iota \alpha$ т $\tau \nu, \phi o ́ \beta o \nu \quad$ т $\bar{\omega} \nu$ 'I.] 'through their fear of the Jews;' as xix. 38. and Jer. $\mathbf{x x x v}$. 11. The Dative with a preposition would be more Classical Greek. So Thucyd. i. 26. ঠéet tē̃̀ Kєpкข $\rho a i \omega \nu$.

14. غंорт $\overline{\mathrm{s}} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu \varepsilon \sigma o u ́ \sigma \eta s ] ~ i . e . ~ o n ~ o n e ~ o f ~ t h e ~ d a y s ~}$ between the 1st and the 7 th, which were the most solemn days, namely, the 3d or 4th day. This use of $\mu \in \sigma$. is common both in the Scriptural and the Classical writers.

- dעéß $\eta$ - $\delta \delta i \delta \alpha \sigma \kappa \epsilon]$ See Lu. ii. 46. and Note. The Gentile philosophers also were accustomed to deliver their instructions in the temples, on account of the sanctity of the place, and the number of persons continually resorting thither. So Philostr. Vit. Ap. v. 26 \& 27. кal


15. $\gamma \rho \dot{\mu} \mu а \tau а$ 」 literas, literature, learning; no doubt, meaning that kind of learning which was alone cultivated in Judæa, namely, the knowledge and interpretation of the Scriptures, and Theology in general ; though, strictly speaking, $\gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ without the Article will not denote that, any more than $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\prime}$ without the Article could mean the Scriptures. Yet here that sense is implied in the subject. Thus the dispute carried on by the Commentators, whether $\gamma \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \mu a \tau a$ means Divine, or human learning, is nugatory. M $\eta$ here seems to be for ov; though this may perhaps be ranged under that usage of the particle pointed out by Hermann and Wahl, by which is indicated a softened negation. Compare Matth. xxii. 12. 2 Cor. xii. 21.
16. $\dot{\eta}$ e $\mu \dot{\eta} \delta \delta \delta \alpha \chi \eta$ ो- $\mu e]$ The sense is: "My doctrine [though not derived from your Schools, is not therefore false, 1 it is, indeed, not mine own, [or self devised,] but derived from God, whose legate I am, and whose," \&c. Compare vv. $17 \& 18$. and xiv. 10.
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17. ed́d tis $\theta \in \lambda \eta, \& c$.] Here are two arguments in proof of the preceding position (namely, that his doctrine is from God), 1 . internal and deduced from the nature and qualities of the doctrine itself ( v .17 ) ; the other external, nameIy, that in what he is doing he has in view, not his own honour, but that of God. (Kuin.) Render, 'He who is minded or disposed to obey the will of God when revealed, however contrary to his prejudices or carnal affections.' See more in Recens Synop., especially the Classical citations from Lampe, to which I have subjoined one from Hermes ap. Stob. Phys. I. 2.698. $\dot{o}$ de
 tis exeivy. By tîs $\delta \iota \delta$. is meant 'this my doctrine.'
 plies another criterion from which the truth of his doctrine may be known, judged, and approved. The whole evangelical history abundantly testifies that Jesus did not teach publicly for the acquisition of fame, or was influenced by ambitious motives, but that all his words, deeds. and purposes had for their sole end the glory of God, and the promotion of human salvation. Now when we see any one seek only the glory of God and the salvation of men, we cannot but infer that God is with him, by his own peculiar and proper assistance, and that He has employed him for revealing and carrying into effect His counsels for the salvation of men; ( Tittm .)

- גंठıкia] 'falsehood, deceit.'

19. oi M м to be a change of subject; and the recent Commentators are mostly of opinion that the words have reference to certain remarks (not recorded by the Evangelists) on the part of the rulers present, charging him with violating the Sabbath, by healing on that day. That principle, however, is objectionable. And we may very well suppose the reference, if such, made, not to any accusation then advanced, but to what had been and still was occasionally brought forward by them. I see no sufficient reason to under-
 Commentators) that ( $p$ art of the Law which enjoins the observance of the Sabbath. It is better, with Euthym., Beza, Lampe, and Tittm., to take it (as propriety requires) of the Law generally, of which the most important injunctions were violated, either in letter or spirit, by the Pharisees. Of this a signal example is then adduced by our Lord, namely, that they are plot-
ting his death; q. d. You do not even keep the Law of Moses, much less mine, or why plot against my life?
20. daıuóvion éxess] Put for the more Clas- $^{2}$ sical term какодаццорâs, and to be taken in a popular sense for, 'You are out of your senses.' The words $\tau$ is $\sigma \in Y_{\eta \tau \pi i}$ diжоктєival are rightly ascribed to the multitude; for they had no designs on the life of Jesus, and were unconscious of those of the Rulers, therefore they might well feel indignant at what they conceived a false accusation. Jesus, however, notices not their unmeited reproach, nor removes their mistake, but proceeds to trace their malevolence and murderous plots to the true origin, namely, his healing the paralytic on the Sabbath day. He shows that they had no reason to censure him on that account, and justifies his actions from their own practice and on their own principles.
 work I did. Өavaí\}єテe. The word is here not to be taken, with most Commentators, in its ordinary sense, but, (with the most eminent Commentators, antient and modern) as at Mark vi. 6. and Galat. i. 6., of that kind of wonder which issues in some feeling, more or less strong, of disapprobation. This idiom is also found in the Classical writers, (on which see my Note on Thucyd. vi. 36.) nor is it unknown in our own language. $\Delta$ ta toüto. These words are by most Commentators and Translators construed with the words following. But the most eminent, both antient and modern, are of opinion that they should be taken with the preceding. And rightly, it should seem ; for ס九a тoũto cannot here have its usual sense; and to regard it as pleonastic, Hebraice, is not satisfactory. As to the sense assigned by Tittm., atqui, it is destitute of authority. It might admit the sense ' Now;' but it is better to construe it with the preceding; for $\theta$ avpá̧elv in the above sense is rarely, if ever, put absolutely, but is always followed by some case, with or without a prepo-
 тiay aùcṑ. Revel. xvii. 7.
21. oùx ö́t, \&cc.] Subaud $\lambda$ é $\boldsymbol{\omega}$. See Bos. Ellip. The sense is: ' Not that it is of Moses [but had been established by Abraham].' It is well observed by Beng., that thus the dignity of circumcision, as compared with the Sabbath, is meant to be exalted, on the ground of its more anticnt institution. See also Euthym. in Recens. Synop. Hence it is plain that the clause con-

1 Deat. 1. 16. 17.
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tains the words of our Lord, not of the Evangelist, as some imagine; nor is there the least ground for the suspicion of Markland, Newcome, and others, that the words are merely a marginal
note.
 popular mode of expression for 'gave you the command of circumcision,' 'established the rite of circumcision.' Kal, 'and [80]:' "A $\nu \theta \rho$ permov. Not a man, but a person, i. e. a boy. The reason given by the Jews for the thing was, that circumcision was an affirmative precept, the Sabbath a negative one, and therefore the former vacated the latter.
23. ei $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau o \mu \eta \nu \nu, \& c$.] An argumentum a minori ad majus. See Lampe. $\Lambda u \notin \hat{y}$. See Note on Matt. xvi. 19. Xodāre; 'are ye [justly] angry ?' or, 'is it possible that ye can be angry? Xo $\lambda$ ầ properly signifies to vent one's bile ( $x o \lambda_{i v}$ ), and in the later writers it is used with a Dative, or an Accus. with rods, in the sense to vent one's bile at, i. e. to be enraged at. In ödov a $\nu \theta \rho \omega \sigma^{2}$ most Commentators and Translators take öd $\lambda_{n} \nu$ as if it belonged to i $\gamma \stackrel{y}{y}$, and were put adverbially for кaӨónov. But the best antient Translators and most eminent modern Commentators, as Grot., Lampe, Markl., Kuin., Rosenm., and Tittm., are with reason agreed that it should be taken with ä $\nu \theta_{\rho \omega \boldsymbol{p}}$ sense, and yet one quite justified by facts; for in a violent paralysis the whole body is affected. So Hippocr. (cited by Lampe) speaking of a poor diseased wretch, says, "O入os $\alpha \nu 0 \rho \omega \pi o s ~ \nu o \ddot{u} \sigma o ́ s$ dort. And Aretzus says of a virulent chronical
 too, (as many of those Commentators think) be an allusion to circumcision being confined to a particular part, but the healing in question extending to the whole. So a Rabbinical writer cited by Wets. says: "Circumcision, which is performed on one of the 248 members of the body, vacates the Sabbath; how much mure the whole body (i.e. the healing of the whole body) of a man [vacates it]."
24. $\kappa a \tau^{\prime} \delta \dot{\delta} \psi \stackrel{ }{ }$ ] There is some doubt as to the sense of this term. The antient and most early modern Commentators, also Wolf and Lampe, think it is equivalent to $\pi \rho o \sigma e n \pi \sigma \lambda_{\eta \pi \tau} \pi \kappa \bar{\omega} s, i . e$. by partiality or preference; a suitable sense, but of which no proof has been adduced. It is, therefore, better, with Erasm., Beza. Wets., Kypke, Kuin., Rosenm., Schleus., and Tittm., to take it to signify a judging by the outward appearance, and consequently superficiully and precipitately. Thus in Is. xi. $3 \& 4$. to judge

кatà dók $\alpha \nu$ is opposed to judging according to truth and equity. Wets. adduces $\alpha \pi^{\prime} \dot{\sigma} \psi \in \cos$ from a kindred passage of Lysias. See also Campb.
 the words is, to suggest a probable reason for their non-molestation of Jesus; which is perhaps, that they have ascertained that he is really the Christ. The second $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \eta \theta$ ois is omitted in very many antient MSS. and Versions, and the Ed. Princ., and is rejected by most Critics and cancelled by Griesb., Vat., Tittm., and Scholz; but on insufficient grounds; for the external evidence is far inferior to that of the common reading; and the internal by no means so strong; for it was more probable that the antient Critics should stumble at the repetition of $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda \eta \theta$ coss, and cancel one of the two (thus in some MSS. and Versions the first $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ oss is omitted) than that any should foist in what could scarcely seem necessary. And yet St. John is so fond of the word, that he uses it exactly as many times as all the other writers of the N.T. put together, and yet never once pleonastically. The same may be said of $\alpha^{\prime} \lambda_{\eta} \theta \eta$ ris and $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta_{\iota} \nu_{o}^{s}$. As to the double use of it here, the former $\lambda_{\eta} \lambda_{\theta} \theta$ oss is confirmed by Joh. vi. 14. vii. $40^{\circ} \alpha \lambda_{\eta} \theta \omega \bar{\omega}$ s $s$ Mpoфทirys. Matt. xiv. 33. \& xxvii. 54. ; the latter by Joh. xvii. 8. "jvco oİa $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta \omega \bar{s}$. The circumstance of eeveral MSS. and Versions omitting both may be accounted for thus. When those Critics, pro sapientia suat, came to think that one of the two words ought to be omitted, they could not always agree to which to apply the knife; and thus the scribes, us wisely, omitted both. It is scarcely necessary to observe how much better the sense proceeds with than without the word in question.
27. aidà roürov, \&c.] These words, I conceive, came not from the same persons as the last, but from others, who intended to reply to the favourably inclined doubters, by showing that Jesus could not be the Messiah. The $\alpha \lambda \lambda a$ may mean aye but, of which and some cognate significations, see examples in the Lexx. N.T. The best Commentators, with reason, interpret the $\pi \delta \theta \epsilon \nu$ not so much of place, but, like the Latin unde, of origin. "The Jews (says Tittm.) thought that the origin of the Messiah would be unknown, and that he would be a, $\boldsymbol{r} \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \rho$ and d $\mu$ ritwo, or at least born of a virgin." Perhaps, however, we may, with Markl. and Kuin., take the mó日cy of both place and person. Indeed, this seems required by what follows.
28. ©́крaگev] ' loudly exclaimed.' See Note


















- кdлk oidate-cini] There is some doubt as to the exact sense of these words. Many Commentators, antient and modern, take them interrogatively. But that is negatived by the $\kappa \dot{j} \mu \dot{c}$ and the cal of the following sentence; and to suppose any clause to be supplied by clip., would be too harsh. They must be taken declaraticely, in this sense: 'Aye ye know me and my origin! And yet that will not prove my claim to be false; for I came not of myself, nor found my claims on self testimony but on the testimony of the God of truth.' This sense of cal 'and yet,' is frequent in St. John. Grot. not improbably thinks that the words are meant to suggest that the genuine father of Jesus, $\boldsymbol{a}^{\boldsymbol{\lambda}} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ Oıyós aútoú strip, was He who sent him; the other, whom they knew, was only עоці\}о́цєуos, 'supposed to be his father.' On ôv iucis oúk oiöate compare viii. $19 \& 53$.

29. $\delta \dot{6}$ ] This is omitted in very many MSS., Versions, the Edit. Princ., and other antient Editions, and cancelled by Math., Griesb., Tittm., Vat., and Scholz. Internal evidence is certainly against it.
30. Tad $\sigma a t$ to apprehend. Htá̧etv was an old Doric form of writing riȩ́etv, and signifies properly to set foot upon. But in the vulgar dialect it was, by a metaphor taken from beasts, and similar to one in our own language, taken to mean to lay hands on, or hold of. Thus it is used both of apprehending men, as here and at v. 32 \& 44 ., viii. 20 . x. 34 . xi. 57. 2 Cor. xi. 32 . Eccles. xxiii. 21., and of catching fish, as Joh. xxi. 3 \& 10. Revel. xix. 20. It occurs in the Sept. and the later Greek writers.

- nipa] i.e. 'full time.'

31. Exiarevarav elis aírdv] On the nature and extent of that belief, see Recens. Synop.
32. yorrú̧outos] muttering. Oi \$a pıбaioa. i. e. those rulers of the Sanhedrin who were of the Pharisaical party.
33. aùrois] The word is omitted in very many of the Manuscripts, Versions, and early

Editions, and is cancelled by almost all the Critical Editors; and with reason. If it be genuine, it must be referred not to the officers, but to Jesus' auditors who were standing around.
34. そทrifers-ípriaere] The best Commentary on the words may be found in the parallel passage at viii. 21., in which and in the present passage the sentiment is, 'When I am gone to Him who sent me, ye shall seek me, or rather the Messiah, and shall find me not,' ie. no other Messiah. For ci pl just after, some would read ci me, go. But this is unsupported by any tolerable authority, and is discountenanced by the usage of the N.T., where eimı no where else occurs. The best Critics are agreed in retaining el $\mu l$, which must be taken in a future sense. With respect to the sentiment in $\%$ nov- $\lambda \lambda \theta \in i v$, it may simply be, 'I shall be out of your reach,' either for harm, or help ; or, as Lampe contends, it is, they shall be excluded from participating in the celestial glory of the Messiah, whom they refused to acknowledge. Our Lord's words are, indeed, (as Tittm. observes) somewhat obscure, as they often were on things future, and not to be quite understood before the events: but (to use the words of Erasm.) "obscurity excites dillgent inquiry. which terminates in a more fully grounded faith."
35. тoū out cos, \&c.] The more ignorant (we may suppose) of the bystanders here mistake our Lord's meaning, and suppose he intends to go to some distant country. By diagtooà tan 'End. some understand the dispersed Greeks, or Gentiles. Others, the dispersed Hellenists, or foreign Jars. But this would require ' $E \lambda \lambda_{\eta}$ yirtai. Hence it is better, with Salmas., Lampe, Krebs, and Tittm., to take diaनmopaiv for the place of dispersion, in this sense: 'Will he go to the region where the dispensed Jews inhabit, and teach the Greeks,' as 1 Pet. i. 1. and James i. 1. To this inquiry our lord did not deign to return any answer.








37. The last and great day of the festival now drew near, of which the Jews used to say that he who had not seen that day, had seen no rejoicing. It was solemn, on account of the libation of water then, in great pomp, fetched from Siloam in golden vessels, and brought, amidst the sounds of masical instruments, to the Temple, where the Priest received it on the high altar, mixed it with wine, and poured it on the altar and the victim. This solemnity was not of Divine institution, but established by their ancestors in memory of the water so plentifully bestowed on the Israelites in the desert; and, as the Rabbins say, a symbol of the benefits to be some time poured out and dispensed by the Holy Spirit. This solemn festival our Lord was pleased to consecrate by a most remarkable discourse, the subject of which was suggested to him by the very solemnity itself. He was in the Temple, he stood in a place where he could be seen by every one, and he spake not only openly, but with a loud voice, as if declaring a thing which it was of the utmost consequence should be known by all. (Tittm.) See a complete account of all the solemnities of this feast in Recens. Synop., formed from the valuable Notes of Lightf., Vitringa, Surenh., Iken., Lampe, \&c.
 desire.' The ratio metaphore has been illustrated with unnecessary minuteness by Lampe and Tittm. The most important remark is, that all such metaphors from words denoting hunger and thirst, imply want of as well as desire for the things in question. Thus the sense of the passage, after withdrawing the imagery, is : 'If any one be desirous of learning, let him commit himself to my instruction, and use aright my doctrine.'
38. $\dot{\dot{o}} \pi เ \sigma \tau \in \cup \cup \omega \nu, \& c$.] On the construction of these words some recent Commentators needlessly deviate from the common opinion, either by connecting $\dot{\delta}$ тioreíco with $\pi$ rıétw in the preceding sentence, or by taking eIre in the sense 'ordered.' The common construction is well defended by Kuin., (in Recens. Syn.) who shows that it is required by the explanation of the words at $v .39$., and from a kindred sentiment at xiv. 2. There is nothing to stumble at in the Nominative $\delta$ жiareviov, which involves an anacoluthon common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, and may be resolved by quod attinet ad, 'As to him who' \&c. Nor is there any reason to suppose the words after ypaфri to be the words of Christ, not of Scripture, because they are not found totidem verbis in Scripture. The best Commentators are, indeed, of opinion that no particular text of Scrip-
ture is had in view, but that the scope is given of several passages there, which refer to the effusion of the Holy Spirit. Yet Surenh. and Schoettg. have, I think, pretty clearly shown that there are only two passages referred to, namely, Is. Iv. 1. and lviii. 11.

- тотацоl- $\dot{\epsilon \in U \sigma о v \sigma เ \nu] ~ \Pi o \tau . ~ i s ~ a ~ s y m b o l ~ o f ~}$ abundance; and jevíouvt alludes to the free communication of the benefits. Koi入ia signifies (like the Hebr. קר בר (p) the heart, or, by synecdoche, the whole man. The metaphor is frequent in the Jewish writings. So Sohar (ap. Recens. Synop.), "When a man turns to the Lord, he is like a fountain filled with living water, and rivers flow from him to men of all nations and tribes." Nor is it unknown in the Classical writers. So Philo. p. 1140 . (cited by
中a $\mu \AA \nu, \& c$. To which may be added Philostr. Vit. Soph. i. 22, 4. p. 525. סшобєкג́кроиуоע dокє тд бróца. which words of Cratinus are spoken

 oróma. Cratinus, doubtless, alluded to the fountain Callirrhoe at Athens, called évעє்́крovyos, mentioned by Thucydides ii. 15. Thus the sense of the passage is: 'Whosoever seeks truth. or desires salvation, must not seek them from Moses or the Jewish' Teachers, but have recourse to me, and drink at the fountain of both, which 1 open.'

39. тoùto dè cixc-aícóv] Here we have an authentic explanation of the allegorical language of the preceding verse. There is not a shadow of reason (with some Critics) to omit the $\ddot{\alpha} \gamma$ cov and insert $\delta \in \delta o{ }^{\prime} \mu e v o \nu$; since the latter is plainly from the margin ; and the former, if not expreswed, would be understood; for there is no ground to suppose (with some recent Commentators) that $\pi \nu \in \bar{\mu} \mu a$ merely denotes the doctrine of Christ, and the knowledge imparted by him. It is clear that we must understand it, not indeed in the Personal sense, (which the Unitarians catch up, merely from thence to deduce that the Holy Ghost is not God) but as denoting His operation and influence, (see Lampe and Tittm.) and, from the adjunct, the gifts of the Holy Spirit ( $\pi \nu \in \cup \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \alpha \quad \chi \alpha \rho / \sigma \mu a \tau a$, as says Euthym.) by which must chiefly be meant, as the occasion requires, (for the Jews themselves supposed the water brought from Siloam to be emblematic of the Holy Spirit, and Christ alludes thereto in the words el $\delta x x^{\bar{a}}, \& c$.) those extraordinary gifts which were conferred on the Apostles and first converts, for the founding of Christianity; though there may (as Tittm. contends) be included those ordinary gifts which were then and are still given to every man to profit withal.
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41．$\mu \dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$, \＆c．］＇What then does，＇\＆c． This use of $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is found in Matth．xxvii． 23. On the force of the $\mu \dot{r}$ ，see Note supra vi． 66.

42．$\dot{\eta} \gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta} \in i \pi \epsilon \nu]$ There is a reference（by a mode of citation familiar to the Jews，and on which see Surenh．）to seceral passages of Scrip－ ture which they explained of the Messiah and his birth，as Is．xi．I．Jerem．xxiii．5．Micah v． 2．Ps．lxxxix． 36.
 been proved by Lampe，that the earlier Jews acknowledged that Christ was of the family of David；and that the Talmudists admitted the Messiah was to be born in Bethlehem．＂EpXeval， ＇is to come．＇

43．$\sigma x i \sigma \mu a]$ The word properly signifies a rent，or fissure；and metaphorically a dissent in opinion．
46．оंঠéтотe— $\dot{d} \boldsymbol{d} \nu \theta \rho \omega \sigma \pi o s]$ Plutarch p． 431. （cited by Alberti）mentions it as a memorable proof of the extraordinary eloquence of Mark Antony，when Marius sent soldiers to kill him，
 to plead for his life，he disarmed their resolution so that they melted into tears and exclaimed， tle oǘco dúvatal eineî̀ wis éкeìyos．
 hedrim，whose duty it was to take care that no false doctrines should be propounded，and to hold inquiry concerning those who were making innovations in the church．（Kuin．）Thus they argue from the two－fold authorities，both judicial and magistral．
49．$\left.d \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \delta \delta x \lambda o s-c i \sigma t\right]$ By $\delta x^{\prime} \lambda o s$ is meant the mob．Lampe，in Recens．Syn．，compares this arrogance with the contempt so decidedly
shown by the Gentiles towards those who had not been initiated into their mysteries．So Sappho
 oن̀ $\theta^{\prime} \dot{\circ} \rho \bar{\omega} \nu$ ，and Hor．Carm．i．3．Odi profanum vulgus et arceo．
lly עópos is here meant the whole Law，both literal and oral．On the exact force of $\dot{<} \pi ⿺ 𠃊 八$ ． т $\dot{\rho} \rho a \tau 0$ the Commentators are not agreed． Lampe observes that the word is used in the LXX．to denote those who by transgression of the Law are doomed to punishment temporal and eternal．Kuin．takes it to mean excommu－ nicated ；but without reason．It is best inter－ preted by Schleus．＇nullius sunt pretii，＇as in
 So our wretch means 1．cursed and abominable； 2．vile and refuse．But inikat．is a stronger term than кaтap．The sense is：＇As to this rabble，they are ignorant of the Law，they are a parcel of poor wretches！＇See my Note on Thucyd．ii． 40. No． 4.
 himself cautiously；he neither openly excuses nor condemns Jesus．Thus Diodotus in his

 ойте катпүорй́коу．
 Interpreters render quempiam，a man．But this does not represent the force of the Article，which involves an ellip．of крıvóevov＇［the accused］ person，＇to be taken out of крivec．At $d \times o \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mathrm{p}$ sub．Tis．

52．${ }^{t} \kappa$ t $\bar{n} \mathrm{~s} \Gamma a \lambda$ ．］i．e．of the Galilæan party．
－ö́c $\pi \rho o \phi \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}$ ，\＆c．］The Commentators are perplexed to reconcile this with the fact，






shev. 20.
in. Deut
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that Galilee had produced four, or perhaps five, great Prophets, as Jonas, Nathan, Habbakuk, Amos, and, as some indeed maintain, Elisha. Most Commentators resort to the expedient of ascribing this to the ignorance and forgetfulness of the Priests, or the hurry of anger. So Doddr. and Campb., the latter of whom translates, ' Prophets come not out of Galilee;' and remarks that men, when their passions are inflamed, are not wont to be accurate in their expressions, or distinct in recollecting, on the sudden, things which make against them; and that therefore this expression of the Pharisees, whom prejudice, pride, and envy concurred in blinding, needs not appear so surprising to us.' This, however, is not quite satisfactory. Ignorance of the common details of Scripture, or the birthplace of its writers, cannot, with any probability, be imputed to the Sanhedrim. Perhaps the difficulty may be removed by availing ourselves of that latitude, in which the Preterite admits of being taken, and which not unfrequently refers to what is customary during a period not long past. The Prophets of the O.T. had all lived 700 or 800 years before. Now the Pharisees, we may suppose, merely advert to what had been usually the case at a comparatively recent date, namely, since the country had borne the name of Galilee. This sense is well expressed by the gloss (for such it is) dreipecat, found in many MSS. and Nonnus.
VIII. 1-11. Of the genuineness of the narration contained in these vv . there has been much doubt. The most eminent modern Commentators regard it either as spurious, or of very doubtful authority. I have, in Recens. Synop., fully detailed the arguments, internal and external, for and against the narration, (placing the objections and their answers one after the other) and, after offering some arguments and observations of my own, have summed up the whole, and decided in favour of its authenticity. As to the internal arguments, they are exceedingly strengthened by the researches of Scholz, who has given the fullest statement of the evidence ever yet laid before the public. Indeed, of those who decide against its authenticity, the greater part (and the more eminent Critics) admit that the narration is founded in fact, and the circumstances happened as they are here narrated; and that, being at first preserved by tradition, it was either subjoined to the Gospel by Papias and the Disciples of St. John, and thus received by the Church, or else was introduced at a later period into the margin of some very antient MSS.,
and thus was afterwards received in the text. But see Recens. Synop.
There can be little doubt, then, but that the portion in question is authentic. And I wonld further observe, that the circumstance that about half the uncial MSS. and about 60 others hiant, throws great light on the omission of this narration in other MSS., and evidently shows that it arose from a mistaken notion of its giving a countenance to immorality, or an ill judged apprehension lest it should be misunderstood by the ignorant. Though it is sufficiently clear that our Lord only declined condemning the woman in a magisterial capacity. As a sinner, he condemned her when he bade her go sin no more. In short, the present portion bears as much the stamp and impress of truth as any in Scripture. Our Lord's answer to the captious interrogators (which is much akin to that on the payment of the tribute money) carries with it a wisdom scarcely exceeded by any which be displayed on any other occasion, and such as would be in vain sought for in the answers returned by the wisest Philosophers in similar circumstances, as recorded by Xenophon, Diogenes Laertius, and others.

 properly used of thieves caught in the act of theft, or with the property upon them ; (see Hesych., emended by me in Recens. Synop.) but more frequently of those detected in the commission of any crime, especially such as is committed furtively. Other verbs of detec-
 times used. 'Eтavt. may be construed either with кaテe入. or with Moix.; but the former method is preferable, as confirmed by the Classical passages cited by the Commentators. It was originally a phrase, è $\pi^{\prime}$ aùvoфф́pẹ, with the ellip. of т $\rho a \gamma \mu a \tau t$; but became at length an adverb.
 see Note in Recens, Synop. Oïv, now.
 strange fancies have been here devised by many ancient and modern Commentators, which may be seen in Lampe. The only correct view seems to be that taken by Euthym., Luther, L. Brug., Grot., Hamm., Lampe, Kypke, and others, that our Lord here used an action frequent with those who do not chuse to answer an improper question, by seeming to be otherwise engaged, of this several examples are given by Schoettg. from the Rabbinical writers. It is clear that our












Lord traced no significant characters；for the action was only a symbolical one，pregnant with meaning，and signifying that he cared not to show any attention to what they were saying， or to answer their insidious question．Or this may have implied contempt，or censure，as if they did not deserve that he should take the trouble to repeat what he had so often incul－ cated，that with Juridical questions he had no－ thing to do；and that they merited no other answer than what they had themselves suggested by appealing to the Mosaic precept．Kypke thinks that as laterem lavare and $\lambda i \theta o \nu$＂̈ $\psi \in \iota$ were proverbial expressions to denote taking useless trouble，so the action in question was meant to indicate，that to fully answer their in－ terrogatory would be useless labour．But here 1 cannot agree with him．
 MS．S．and Fd．，and adopted in E．V．and by several Commentators，are a manifest gloss．

7．àvaкúqas」 Theophyl．explains divaxúqas ipuycìv．
 are not agreed on what is here meant by ava－ мápтŋтos．Some take it to denote freedom from adultery；others，freedom from any notorious sin，like adultery；others，again，freedom from $\sin$ in general．But this last interpretation can－ not be admitted，since it would be too favour－ able to the adulteress，and be inconsistent with our Lord＇s emphatic censure of her crime．Of the other senses，the former seems alone the true one．And it is adopted by the best modern Commentators．It may，however，very well in－ claude fornication，concubinage，and lasciviousness of every kind（even that of the heart，See Math． v．28．）nay，perhaps causeless divorce．To the extreme corruption of morals in his countrymen Josephus bears ample testimony：and that the priests and scribes deeply participated in this corruption there is no reason to doubt ；for the Rabbinical writers supply abundant proofs of the lasciviousness of even the most eminent
 the Classical writers often used of adultery and fornication，is well known．If the word be taken in the above extensive sense（which is fully war－ ranted by Scripture）there will be no reason to doubt but that every one of the persons present was，more or less，guilty．As to the objection of Le Clerc and others，that no law demands
perfect innocence in its judges，\＆c．，it may be observed，that our Lord is here not speaking juridically，but popularly，and considers the thing in for o conscientic，as in the passages of Cicero and Synesius compared by Grot．，and that of Plant．ap．Recens．Synop．Thus our Lord did by no means absolve the accused，but smote the consciences of the accusers．
 cast the stone at her．＇By the stone is meant （as the best Commentators are agreed）the fatal stone，which was first cast in form by one of the witnesses，and served as a signal to the by－ standers to commence the stoning．See Deut． xvi． 6.

8．cal má入ıy—тウ̀ע $\gamma^{\eta} \nu \nu$ ］The best reason that has been alleged for the repetition of this sym－ bolical action，is that it was meant to give the priests and scribes an opportunity of withdraw－ ing with less confusion．But，in fact，this was a counterpart to the former action．

9．Tins ouvetón＇ $\operatorname{cocos}]$ This term，like conscientia in Latin，is employed list．generally，to denote the innate light of reason by which any one possessing in himself the seeds and the rule of truth and falsehood，is conscious of his own exist－ ence，essence，relation，\＆c．But it is used more specially by the Philosophers and by the sacred writers to denote the faculty consequent upon it， by which a man exercises right judgment on the goodness or badness of his actions．Hence the office of reproof，rebuke，and conviction is well attributed to it；for，according to the expressive saying of Juven．Sat．xiii．2．Prime est hæc ultio，quod，se Judice，Memo nocens absolvitur． （Lampe．）In illustration of this，Wets．com－ pares several passages of Philo，to which I have in Recens．Synop．added others from Eurip．and Appian．

Un is ca 日＇cis see Note on Mark xiv．19．By $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta u \tau \in \dot{\rho} \infty \nu$（as Kuchen remarks）is here meant the more honourable，as by $\dot{\epsilon} \chi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \tau \infty=1$ the lowest in degree or station．See Mark ix．35． All that is to be understood is，that they all went out one after another，of every station and
 pleonastic，＇ED $\mu$ é $\sigma \not \boldsymbol{c}_{\text {p }}$ ，ie．in medico corona discipulorum Christi．

10．кaтéxpive］＇condemned，pronounced sen－ tense on thee．＇
 will I pass sentence on thee．＇Mopeviou \＆＇c．We
11. $8,9$. 9.5. et 12.46

1. 5.31.















are not to take this as a remission of her sins, (which, as supreme Lord, he might have pronounced) but simply a declaration that, since his kingdom was not of this world, so he would not assume the office of temporal magistracy. False, therefore, is the conclusion hence of some, who infer that our Lord did not approve of adultery being punished with death. For, upon the same principle they might argue that, when our Lord declined to act as judge between the brothers disputing about an inheritance (see Lu. xii. 15.) he did not approve of inheritances being divided, and did not care that the disputes thence arising should be amicably settled. (Lampe.) To prevent any mistake of his meaning, our Lord added $\mu$ ทiкеть $\alpha^{\prime} \mu \alpha \dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{\tau} \alpha \nu \epsilon$.
2. Now follow to the end of the Chapter certain discourses pronounced by our Lord in the Temple, on some other occasion, though what that was, cannot be determined. The Commentators variously speculate. Tittm. thinks vv. 12-19 are a continuation of the discourse at vii. 38. seqq. The scope of the address he thinks the same; but another metaphor is adopted, that of the Sun. "For (says he) as that luminary not only gives light, but imparts life and vigour to all created things, so Christ not only enlightehs the mind, but also gives life and salvation." Thus our Lord is represented as the great moral Teacher, and especially the only Saviour of the world. Indeed the former as well. as the latter is an attribute of Deity; for the Rabbinical writers speak of God as the light of the uorld, and say that the light dwelleth alone with Him. And as darkness is often, in those writings, used to denote vice and iniquity, and life to signify virtue and its concomitant happiness, so $\phi \bar{\omega} s$ toū nó $\sigma \mu$ ov may very well denote the Messiah, who shall enlighten, bless, and save the human race. Indeed this is required by the words following

3. $\sigma \dot{v}$ тєिl $\sigma \in a u \tau o \bar{u} \mu a \rho \tau$. \&c.] The foregoing lofty claim the Pharisees do not openly reject, but put aside by such a sort of argument as they thought Jesus could not rebut, namely, that self commendation has no force, and no one
can bear witness in his own case. This our Lord had before admitted, supra v. 31. But he removes the objection by arguing that though in common life the rule is not to be rejected, yet an exception to it must be admitted in his own person, who had come down from Heaven possessed of the fullest Divine knowledge, (see vi. 46.) for the purpose of imparting it to men ignorant of celestial things, or what was the true nature of His office. Therefore the words "I know whence I came and whither I go" contain a periphrasis of Divine legation. The sense may be thus expressed: 'My testimony is perfectly true; for I know with what authority I act, and what commands have been given to me: $y$ ou cannot know, except you learn of me.' See Grot. and Kuin.
 sense is: 'Ye are used to judge according to the external appearance, warped by passion and prejudice [and therefore your judgment is unsound].'

- où kpiveo ovò́éva] Lampe contends that the sense is, 'I as yet judge no man, being now only a Teacher.' Kuin. and Tittm. supply оüтшъ, or катà бápка.
16-18. Here follows another argument : 'I do not alone bear testimony of myself; God bears, testimony of me by the miracles which I work.' (Kuin.) The passage is thus paraphrased by Tittm.: "But even were 1 to bear the most honourable testimony of myself, yet it would be true, and worthy of faith ; for neither am I alone, nor is my testimony solitary, but my Father also who sent me, hath testified of me,' namely, by the Prophets. 'Our Lord (says Tittm.) employs the same kind of argument as at v . 37. seqq. But, he continues, it is ordained by your law that the testimony of two witnesses is worthy of credit. Therefore ought also my testimony of myself to be thought worthy of credit, since it is not of myself only, but likewise of my Father, who hath sent me.

19. $\pi o \bar{u}$ दो $\sigma \tau \iota \nu \dot{\delta} \pi a \tau \eta \dot{\rho}$ rov] On the scope of these words the Commentators are not agreed. The best founded opinion seems to be that of
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Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm., that they were said not from ignorance, but by way of insult, $q$ : d . Where is this Father of yours, that we may inLerrogate him? we do not see this other witness. To which our Lord indignantly replies, ' Your very question betrays the malignity of your hearts, and shows that you neither know, nor care to know, either me or my father. If you would know me as a Teacher sent from Heaven, you would know that it is God who beareth witness of me, though not in a visible way, yet by miracles.'
21. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda(\nu)$ This shows that the following discourse was pronounced at another time, and that it has no connexion with the preceding. The sense is: 'I am about to depart, and ye shall seek the help of the Messiah, (and therefore of me, who am the Messiah; ) but in vain; for having rejected my claims, there remaineth no
 A mode of expression taken from Ezek. iii. 19. $\mathbf{x v i i i} .26$. $x \times x$ xiii. 9 and 18 . ' $E \nu$, 'by, on account
 ' in this your sin,' i.e. obstinate incredulity and putting Jesus to death. But the expression seems general, and may therefore best be rendered in the plural. So Euthym. well paraphrases: ' 1 came to deliver you from all your sins; but ye would not : therefore I depart, and ye shall afterwards die in all your sins, inasmuch as ye would not be delivered from them.' By dioot. is denoted not so much temporal death, (namely, at the destruction of Jerusalem) but eternal death, figuratively for a state of everlasting woe.
 wilful perversion of our Lord's meaning, and a scornful repartee; q. d. What will he make away with himself, to get away from this our pretended persecution? See vii. 20. This imputation of intended suicide involved, even according to the opinions of the Jews. great criminality; for we find from Josephus that the Pharisees thought the lowest pit of Hell was reserved for self-murderers.
23. їцеīs $d \kappa \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \& c$.] Our Lord does not deign to notice the above absurd and malignant sally, but points at the cause of it by adverting to their difference in disposition as well as origin, from himself; they being of earthly origin and grovelling minds, he of celestial origin and heavenly minded. Compare Joh. iii. 31. Lampe, however, has shown that the Divine origin of our Lord necessarily involves his perfect holiness. Our Lord means to bint, that it is their earthly and corrupt dispositions that hindered them from believing, and would consequently cut them off from salvation.
24. ö́ $\tau \iota \dot{d} \gamma \omega^{\circ} \epsilon l \mu t$ ] Scil. dкcivos, namely, that personage expected and predicted of by the Patriarchs and Prophets. An ellip. found also in a kindred passage at Mark xiii. 6. See also Deut. xxxi. 29 . and Acts xiii. 25. Here we have another instance of our Lord's consummate modesty.
25. où ris el;] The best Commentators are agreed that the question is not one of simple ignorance, but addressed by way of scornful rebuke, q. d. Who art thou who speakest so loftily of thyself, and rebukingly to us? Our Lord, however, was pleased to answer them as if it had been the former.

- Tij $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu-i \mu i \nu]$ On the sense of these mords the Commentators are not agreed. It hinges upon tiv $\dot{i} \rho \chi^{\prime \prime} \nu$, where the antient and older Commentators suppose an ellip. of кaтa, and take the phrase for $\dot{d} \pi^{\prime} \alpha \rho \chi \bar{\eta} s$. The $\alpha \rho \chi \eta \nu$ some suppose denotes the beginning of office; others, the beginning of the present address; which latter opinion is preferable. Thus the expression may simply mean dudum, or etiam nunc, as in Gen. xliii. 18. Thus $\lambda a \lambda=\omega$ will be for d $\lambda{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda_{\eta \sigma a}$, 'I have been telling you.' The recent Commentators most of them take riv d $\rho \times \dot{\eta} \nu$ to mean omnino. But that signification, however common in the Classical writers, is no where found in the N.T. or Sept.

26. $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ Exw $\& c$.] These words are, from brevity, somewhat obscure; but the sense seenis

















to be: 'I could say much more in reference to you and in condemnation of your unbelief; but I shall content myself with saying that as I am sent from the great Father of truth, so what I publicly aver is from Him, and therefore must be true.' Compare a kindred passage at vii. 28. Kpivetv is here meant to further define $\lambda a \lambda \in i ̃$.
27. oùк є́ $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma a \nu-\varepsilon ̃ \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu$ ] The sense is: - They did not, or cared not to know that he spake unto them of (i.e. that he meant) his Father, viz. in heaven, God.
 speaks in ænigma, wisely intending that, as he could not use plain terms, to employ such as, though obscure, might be laid up in the minds of the reflecting, and bear fruit, when explained by the event. Compare similar passages at iii. 14. and xii. 32. At elut sub. exceivos.

- тоเज̄] 'am doing.' It is well remarked by Chrysost., that in $\kappa a \theta \bar{\omega} s-\lambda a \lambda \bar{\omega}$, our Lord speaks mure humano. V. 29 is closely connected with the preceding, and the sense is, 'who having sent me, leaves me not alone, but aids and supports me, because I thus perform his will in all things.'

31. غáv i $\mu \in i s, \mu \in i \nu \eta \tau \in \& c$.] The sense is: - If ye adhere with constancy to my doctrine, and act upon it, in a holy obedience by your lives.' ' $\mathrm{E} \mu \mu$ éveıv signifies properly to remain in a place, but metaphorically to abide by a design, agreement, \&c.
32. $\gamma \nu \omega^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta \epsilon$ тìv $\left.\dot{d} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon a \nu\right]$ The sense is: - ye shall experimentally find the truth of my doctrine, as well as that of the Divine origin and legation which I claim.' Compare v. 28. and vii. 17. Christ adds yet more, кal ij $\alpha \lambda \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text {eca }}$
 true doctrine promulgated by him, Goopel truth. 'Eגev日. signifies 'will liberate you from the bondage to $\sin$ and Satan.' Servitude is, by a metaphor common both in the Scriptural and Classical writers, a perpetual symbol of rice.
 just mentioned, but othets of the bystanders, who here perversely misrepresent Christ's meaning.
 had been enslaved not only by the Egyptians and Babylonians, but were subject to the Romans, many Commentators regard this as an impudent falsehood uttered in the heat of disputation. But the manner of the speakers, it may be observed, indicates not rage, but craftiness. It is better, with others, to take dedoud. in such a restricted sense as the truth of history (which is traced by the Commentators) will amply justify. Yet it seems preferable, with most recent interpreters, to regard the words as spoken of themselves only and their ourn age. And assuredly the Jews, even after they became subject to the Roman Empire, were left in the enjoyment of no inconsiderable liberty political as well as religious. See Notes on Matt. xvii. 24 and 27. xv. 26 and 60. Our Lord now shows that he meant not political, but moral and spiritual liberty. Compare vi. 17. See v. 32.
33. $\delta$ dè doūdos-alōva] Here is employed a gnome generalis, and an illustration drawn from what is usual in common life; q. d. Slaves have no claim to remain continually in the same family, but may, at the pleasure of their owner, be sold unto another. Not so the son; he cannot be alienated from the family. Thus it is with the servants of sin, who may at any time be excluded from God's house and favour into outer darkness. Whereas those who have the liberty of the sons of God will abide in it for ever. V. 36 contains another view engrafted on the former, the same comparison being otherwise accommodated. And as in the foregoing verse there is a comparison between the state of a slave, and that of the son and heir, so in this there is, I conceive, one between the freedom communicated by the lord, and that by his som.












with the concurrence of his Father. For as there may have been cases in which a Proprietor could not manumit without the consent of the son and heir, or at least a manumission in which the son concurred with the father, might be regarded as being doubly effectual ; so the freedom and salvation produced by the conjoint manamission of both Father and Son is most truly effectual. The being "free indeed" respects that adoption and affiliation so often touched on by St. Paul.
 Lord grants their assertion ; but makes use of it to show the inconsistency between their boasted claims of ancestry and their present conduct. How degenerate must those descendants of Abraham be who pursue a conduct the reverse of his pure and blameless spirit, by plotting the death of Him to whom both the Patriarchs and Prophets bear witness. Then is suggested the reason for that rejection of his doctrine which made them plot against his person, namely ${ }^{2} \tau t \dot{o}$ 入óyos -imit, where the Commentators are not agreed on the, exact sense of xøpei. The sense 'has place,' adopted by many eminent antient and modern ones, is destitute of authority, and not definite or significant enough. And that of 'non capitur,' 'is not understood,' is alike devoid of authority. The best interpretation seems to be that of Nonnus, Grot., De Dieu, Camer., Lampe, Rosenm., Kain., and WaAl, 'does not go into,' or penetrate, 'your hearts.' This includes the sense making a progress, producing effect, and being comprehended and received. - $2 \nu$ is for els, which is the proper construction, as Matt. xv. 17. This hypallage may be accounted for by observing that there is here a census pregnans, including two phrases of diffferment constructions.
34. The scope of the verse (which is variously but not successfully traced by the Commentators) seems to be simply that of making a parallel between His actions and theirs, to account for their rejection of Him. He faithfully delivers the doctrine He has learnt from and with His Father; they do the rooks which they have learnt from their Father, even the Devil, as is more clearly signified further on. The account given by Josephus of the Jews of his time fully vindicates our Lord's words from any charge of exaggerasion.
 physical sense to see, but the moral sense to perceive, i.e. understand, know, learn.
35. $\dot{\dot{c}} \pi \alpha \pi i j-\dot{c} \sigma \tau!$ The scope of the passage is not well discussed by the Commentators. It should seem that the Jews, not knowing that by their father Jesus had meant the Devil, and not quite understanding what was meant by their "seeing things with their father," and regarding it as disrespectful to Abraham, take refuge in their former allegation, and simply repeat that Abraham is their father, in whom they trust. To this our Lord objects, that they are not Abraham's sons in the spiritual and real sense. namely, those who closely copy his example and do his works. This, He shows in the next verse, they are the farthest from doing, by their plotting the murder of one who had told them the whole truth from God.
From the Rabbinical citations of Wets. it is clear that this figurative sense of son was well known to the Jews. See the same Commentator's paraphrase of this passage in Recens. Synop.; in which he skilfully contrasts the belief and practice of Abraham with that of the Jews, of whom the former received every revelation of the will of God and discovery of the truth, with unreserved faith and obedience.
The $\dot{a} \nu$ after $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi o t e i \tau e ~ i s ~ o m i t t e d ~ i n ~ m a n y ~ g o o d ~$ MSS. and some Versions, and Fathers, together with the Ed. Princ. and other Fd., and is cancelled by Griesb., Titty., Vater, and Scholz. But the thing is by no means certain ; and the ad $\nu$ is strongly confirmed by a kindred use at $\mathbf{v} .42$.
36. עüv] This is, as Lampe observes, used assumpticely, as ix. 41. xviii. 36 . Acts xv. 10. and often in Thucyd.
37. Topveias] The best Commentators are agreed, that the word here, as often, signifies idolatry, which was considered by the Jews as a sort of spiritual adultery, since so close was the connexion of the people of Israel with God, that it was compared to the conjugal one. Compare Judge. ii. 17. 1 Para. v. 25. Is. i. 21. Hos. 1. 2. iv. 12. Their meaning therefore is : 'If thou art now speaking of our natural Father, know that we recognise no other Father than God. To Him we are dear and beloved, like children : Him only do we worship.' This argument our Lord rebuts by again adverting to the spiritual sense of Father.
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42. $\left.\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu \kappa a l \eta \eta^{\prime} \kappa \omega\right]$ The sense is: 'I proceeded forth from God, and come hither [as his Legate].' The former term has reference to the character of Jesus as the eternal Son of God ; the latter, as Legate, Mediator, and Redeemer. Compare vi. 46. vii. 29. xiii. 3. xvi. 27, 28. xvii. 7 and 25.
43. $\left.\lambda a \lambda_{c \alpha}{ }^{2}{ }^{2}\right]$ for $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v ~ o r ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o u s, ~ n a m e l y, ~$ those which he had just delivered, and such like, indeed his dectrine in general. Гıшш⿱㇒日кете has reference to that full comprehension of our Lord's words, which the Jews certainly had not, and the reason of which is suggested in the next words oì ס̇́yaote \&c., where dóv. must be understood of the moral inability arising from perversity and indisposition to receive what is said. Compare Joh. vii. 7. and Jerem. vi. 16. 'Aкoúcı here, as often, signifies to hearken, to give heed to what is said.
44. $\dot{\text { veisis- }}<\alpha \beta$ ódou] Our Lord now speaks more plainly, pointing out their true spiritual Father. Oénece is a very significant term, importing full intention and strong determination. He then points at two of the principal characteristics in which their similarity to their Diabolical father consists, namely in man-slaying, and in lying. ' $A \pi$ ' $\alpha \rho \chi \bar{\eta} s$ denotes here, as often, ' from the beginning of the world.' Compare i.1. and 1 Joh. iii. 8 . The expression carries the notion of continuance and perseverance in. In $\dot{d}^{2} \nu \theta$ рштоктóvos there is not, I conceive, a reference (as some imagine) to the murder of Abel committed at the insugation of Satan; nor must the sense of the word be explained away, with others. The word must be taken in its proper sense, as Euthym., Lampe, and Tittm. have shown; and must be referred to the seduction of our first parents, called d d $\theta$ рwтoкovia as "bringing death into the world, and all our woe;' the thing being brought about by Satan's machinations. Thus a Rabbinical writer cited by Schoettg. says "t the children of the old Serpent, who killed Adam and all his posterity." It is also ascribed to the Devil in Wisd. ii. 24.
 a strong affirmation by a negation of the contrary. And as to stand in any action is to steadfastly practise, so the sense here is; 'He has perpetually fallen away and deviated from the truth.' This is again expressed in another form of expression occurring also in 1 Joh. i. 8., 2 Macc.
vii. 18., and often in the Rabbinical writers, and denoting that there is no principle of truth in him. "E $\sigma \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon$ has (zs almost always) a sense of present time, or rather is used indefinitely of all times.
The idea is further illustrated in the words following, where $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ lotion is taken by the best Commentators as put for toù lòıópacos, his natural disposition.' So Porphyry (cited by Lampe) speaking of demons, says td $\psi$ cuzos toútots olkelov. This, however, is only a parallel sentiment; and as no example has been adduced of this sense of $\tau \alpha^{\prime}$ idia, we may hesitate to receive it. Indeed that will depend upon the interpretation of the following clause, where aùroù cannot have reference to $\psi \in \dot{u} \sigma \boldsymbol{T} \boldsymbol{\eta}$, but (as almost all Commentators are agreed) to $\psi$ eùos further back in the sentence; certainly not to
 As, however, auंтoü is thus solecistic, and roútou would be required, I am inclined to think, with Bp . Middl. that the subject at $\lambda a \lambda \overline{\bar{y}}$ is not $\dot{\dot{o}}$ סtá $\beta$ o $\lambda o s$, but $\tau t s$, any one of you, to be supplied. This construction (examples of which abound in the Classical writers) was. we may suppose, adopted in order to make the application less personal and offensive. Thus autoū will have its usual sense; and $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ lठícov will signify ex cognatis, after the manner of his kindred; and
 may be rendered, 'for his father too is a liar.' This interpretation is strongly confirmed by the next verse, in which our Lord brings home to them this charge of lying, and represents their rejection of the truth from Him as the result of their habitual untruth. The charge is severe, but by no means exaggerated; for (as Campb. says) a man's mind may, by gross errors and inveterate prejudices, be so alienated from the simplicity of truth, that the silliest paradoxes, or wildest extravagancies in opinion, shall have a better chance of gaining his assent, than truths almost self-evident.
45. d ${ }^{\left(\omega^{\circ}\right]}$ ] This is emphatic and is opposed to the dxeivos at v. 44.
46. $\tau i s \quad \dot{\xi} \xi \dot{\dot{\nu}} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu-\alpha \mu \alpha \rho \tau i a s]$ The scope of this address is to convince them of his credibility by another and a popular kind of argument. 'A A aptia cannot here have the usual sense sin. The best Commentators take the term to denote not sin, according to the common acceptation,

















but error，or falsehood in doctrine，as opposed to true doctrine．Of this signification of the word many examples are adduced，to which 1 have in Recons．Synop．added others more apposite，as

 ＇Eג＇́रXei must be rendered，not continceth，but （as Campo．shows）conricteth．Thus in a kindred passage of Aristoph．Put．574．（cited by Feck－
 тойтov．
Jesus appeals to his auditors whether they can make out any such charge against him of vice in action，or falsehood in words，as to war－ rant his claims being disregarded；as in the appeal of Moses to the Israelites，Numb．xvi． Such an interrogative appeal involves the force of a strong negation．Thus in the words follow－ ing the hearers are supposed to have answered， No one！The inference is manifest．In v．47．the argument is followed up．＇If ye were really， as ye boast，sons of God，ye would hearken to and yield credence to the words of God by me， His legate］．＇The very reason why ye hearken not to them is that ye are not of God，＇i．ie．sons of God．＇Ex；roù $\Theta$ eoù sivas is equivalent to viol toù $\theta_{\text {ecu rival．}}$
48．Not being able to answer these arguments， the Jews are fain to have recourse to reviling．
－इapapeirns－Yes］Of these two expres－ gins the latter has been explained at vil． 20 ． The former appears from the Rabbinical writers to have been a term of reproach equivalent to calling any one a heathen，or a heretic；for the Samaritans were accounted both，in opinion and in practice．
49．Here our Lord，with mild dignity，rebuts the above frantic charge．Tıṻv $\tau d \nu \eta$ Пatioa here signifies，cum effectu，the executing his Father＇s injunctions，by delivering his message and doctrine．Compare xvii．4．This honour of God would not be rendered by a demoniac．
＇A入入à imo，nay．The sense of the next words is， ＇and you［in return］treat me with disgrace．＇
 ever，it is not my part to vindicate my honour ； ［nor need I ；］there is a Being who will vindicate it，and hold judgment on men as to their recep－ ton of me．＇

51．táv ts rudy $\lambda o ́ y o \nu \& c$.$] Here our Lord$ especially adverts to the happy lot of those who receive his covenant of grace，and observe its requisitions．In this place $\theta$ ecupeì 日ávatov， like ldeiv $\theta$ jivaro at Lu．ii．26，signifies，＇to experience death．＇But by $\theta d \dot{d}$ ．is here meant death spiritual，the death or misery of the soul in a future state．Yet，though it has been proved that the phrase as well as the doctrine was not unknown to the Jews，the hearers misunderstand or pervert our Lord＇s words，and endeavour thereby to fasten on him the charge of being possessed with a dæmon．And as this claim to confer immortality implied the possession of it himself，the Jews justly interpreted this as an arrogation of superiority over Abraham and the Prophets．
 donment of the construction for cal $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ-$ qi tern oi $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\epsilon} \theta a v o v$ ．They only stumbled at these claims because they would not acknow－ ledge his Messiahship．For the Jews did not deny that the Messiah was to be far superior to all the Patriarchs and Prophets，and even Angels．

54．Here our Lord rebuts the charge of arro－ glance and vain glory，by showing that this glory is not sought by him，but given him by the Father．Compare v． 52.
－ovidéy docıv］＇is nothing worth．＇An idiom common in both the Scriptural and Classical
 civet；an idiom found in the Classical writers． from whom examples are adduced by Raphael and Kypke．
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55. кal oùk é $\gamma$.] 'And [yet] ye do not truly know Him, because ye refuse to admit me.' See Note on vii. 28. sq.
56. 'Авраал-ех $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho \eta$ ] Our Lord here contrasts their feeling towards Him with that of Abraham, of whom they so boast; and that in order to hint at his Messiahship and consequent superiority to Abraham. 'H $\gamma \alpha \lambda \lambda$ tá $\sigma a \tau o$, Z 7 La , Ton , 'would have exulted, regoiced at seeing.'
 promised Saviour, (See Joel ii. 1.) should come into the world.' 'Tóciv $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{f} \rho a \nu$ signifies to live to any time; of which examples are adduced by
 'and he saw it with delight,' i. e. as the recent Commentators explain, in Orcus, or the seat of the righteous dead (see Lu. xvi. 23. \& Notes.) In proof of which the learned Commentators adduce much specious illustration. But, after all, the meaning may be, as the older Commentators interpret, ' he saw it by the eye of faith, so strong as to be compared to sight.' See Hebr. xi. 13. 1 Pet. i. 10-12. Lu. x. 24. And that, in some measure, by a revelation made to him on being commanded to offer up Isaac.
57. $\pi \in \nu \tau i к о \nu \tau a \dot{e ́ v} \eta$ \&c. . The Commentators in general have been need lessly perplexed with these words, which are best treated by Beza, Rosenm., and Kuin. This mode of speaking is well accounted for on the principle that opponents in argument sometimes grant more than their antagonists ask, in order to vanquish them in the end more effectually. The number fifty is used not (as Grot. supposes) as being a round number, but because among the antients fifty was considered as the age when any one was past his vigour, and was discharged from severe political and religious services. Thus the sense is: 'Thou art not yet even $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\prime} \tau \eta \mathrm{f}$, much less $\gamma$ 'ipши.'
58. т $\rho$ l $A \beta \rho a \dot{\alpha} \mu-t \gamma \omega$ cini] This passage is of the highest importance, as illustrating the supreme majesty of Christ, by showing his preexistence long before his birth in this world; and also, by what appears an assumption of the name of Jehovah, of his Divinity. There has, however, been some difference of opinion among Commentators on the sense of the words. As to the Unitarian interpretation, which explains the existence not of nature, but of destination, in this sense: 'Before Abraham was [Abraham, the father of many nations, in a mystucal sense] I already was destined to be the Messiah;'-it is perhaps the most far-fetched and frigid ever
broached even in that School. It is utterly inconsistent with the context, and is quite inadmissible by introducing an unauthorized addition into the sentence. See the unanswerable refutations of Whitby, Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm. Having seen what is not, let us examine what is the sense. The antient and most earlier modern Commentators took al $\mu \mathrm{l}$ to denote the eternal eristence and consequently Divinity of Christ, as bearing the appellation of Deity, " 1 am that I am." And this interpretation has been ably supported by Euthym. Glass, Whitby, and especially Lampe. After all, however, they have not thoroughly established the point. Hence many of the most eminent Commentators, as Grot., Drus., Heins., Simon, Le Clerc., Wolf, and Wets., and almost all those of the last century, (including Rosenm., Kuin., and Tittm.) take the Present as put for the imperfect, of which a multitude of examples are adduced from the Scriptures. See Glass and Win. Gr. Thus the sense will be: ' before Abraham existed, I was in existence;' a doctrine quite agreeable to many other passages of the N.T., especially this Gospel. See i. 1 \& 2. iii. 13. vi. 46 \& 62 . vii. 29 . xvii. 5. That use, however, (like enallage of every kind) has its limits; and, among other cases, it cannot be admitted where the sense entirely turns on the word in question ; for thus an uncertainty would be produced, at varianco with the chief purpose of language. The fact is, that this peculiar use of civat on the present occasion, if it does not amount to conferring on Christ the appellation of Deity, still may reasonably be thought to express together with existence prior to a given perind, (which is sufficiently pointed out by the revéofat preceding) uninterrupted existence since that time, and, by implication, existence unconnected with ANy time, i. e. eternal duration, an attribute of the God-
 $\theta \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota, \Sigma \cup$ ci. Thus the same sense will arise as in the former interpretation; an attribute of Deity being employed for an appellative. In this way, it should seem, the Jews must have understood Jesus, otherwise they would not, in exasperation, have attempted to stone him for blasphemy.
 suppose an Hendiadys, in íкрúße каl $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi_{\tilde{\eta}} \lambda \theta \in \boldsymbol{y}$; or (as. Winer, Gr. Gr. 5 47.3.) refer it to the rule by which of two verbs in connexion one is to be rendered as an adverb. It is not, however, necessary to resort to that principle here. Jesus,







it should seem, hid himself for the moment, and soon afterwards went out of the temple. We need not, with the older Commentators, suppose this concealment miraculously effected, by vanishing from the sight of the multitude. Not only nothing is said to that effect, but the words following rather discountenance such a view. See Note on Lu. iv. 30 . Indeed the words $\delta i c i \lambda \theta a_{i}$ oüross have been rejected by many of the best Commentators, and are cancelled by Griesb. But there is scarcely evidence sufficient to warrant even any strong suspicion; for the words are only omitted in one MS., (and that one of the most altered) two or three very recent and inferior Versions, and two or three Fathers. And as the words are not at all essential to the sense of the passage, the testimony of Versions and Fathers cannot here have much weight. All the most antient Versions hare it; and the Fathers adduced have it in other citations. Finally, it is confirmed by the metrical version of Nonnus. I cannot help suspecting that the Critic who formed the text of the Mis. before mentioned (and some other Critics of his age as wise as himself) threw out the words for no better reason than to remove two tautologies.
 along. This signification occurs also in Matt. xx. 30. Mark ii. 14. xv. 21., and is preferable to that of 'having departed,' namely, from the temple, which is assigned by some of the best Commentators.

- $\boldsymbol{\tau} \varphi \phi \lambda \partial \nu$ dx $\gamma \in \nu$.] And consequently incurable by any human art.

2. oüros Many of the best Commentators think that there is here a reference to the doctrine of the $\pi \rho o 0 \pi a \rho \xi s$, pre-existence of souls, or of
 migration of souls into other bodies, by which what a soul had sinned in one body might be punished in aoother. Others, however, as Lightf. and Lampe, deny this, maintaining that it cannot be proved that the Jews in the age of Christ held any such doctrine. But granting that this cannot be fully proved; yet considering that the doctrine was held in the surrounding nations, especially Esypt, it seems next to impossible that the disciples of Jesus should not have heard of it. And that is all that the question may imply ; for it breathes the language not of positite belief seeking for confirmation, but of doubt and ignorance seeking for information. Their question as to what caused this natural blindness rested on the common notion, prevalent also among the Heathens, that all dangerous diseases, or grievous calamities must have been produced by the intervention of some heinous sin, which they were meant to punish. A notion likely to be held by those who lived under a dispensation, which dealt much in temporal and
corporal punishment. Now in applying this to the case of any disease which befel a person in the course of his life, there was reason for perplexity ; since it might be referred either to his own sin, or the sin of his parents; for the Jews likewise held that the sin of parents when not suffered for by themselves, was visited upon their children in the form of disease or calamity. See Ecclus. xi. 28. But how to apply this to the case of any disease burn with a person, occasioned no little perplexity. Now for a solution of this difficulty the disciples apply-whether with the dogma of metempsychosis in their minds, or not, cannot be determined. The former, however, is the more probable. That they should have had in view (as Lightf. and Kuin. think) the Rabbinical doctrine, that infants could and did sin in the womb, is very unlikely; for that absurd fancy is only found in the Rabbins of several centuries after the time of Christ.
3. oüтe oùros-aùroū] Repeat tעa ruф入òs $\gamma e \nu \nu \eta \theta \eta$, ' This blindness is from no sin ether in his parents or in himself.'

 Our Lord did not vouchsafe to give any answer to the inquiry which seems to have been concealed under this interrogatory, but fixes their attention on a matter of far greater moment ; namely, the truth, that God permits diseases to afflict men for His own wise purposes : here the manifestation of His own glory in the miracle worked by his Messiah, one of whose characteristic miraclev (see Is. xxxv. 5.) was giving sight to the blind. The inferences to be drawn from our Lord's words on the use of affliction are obvious.
 is best traced by Lampe as follows: "By me [ 1 say] it is necessary that these works should be [now] performed [notwithstanding the objections on the score of prudence]; now [! repeat] while there is yet time and opportunity,' \&c. In ё $\rho$ Хeтat $\nu \dot{\nu} \xi \mathbb{E} \mathrm{E}$. we have a gnome generalis, or adage. The day is the $\tau d \dot{\delta} \nu \in \rho \gamma d \nu$, the time for business; the night is the tempus inopportunum negotio. Our Lord meant thereby to obscurely signify that his continuance with men would be short, and that he should not long convince them by his miracles, or enlighten them by his doctrines.
4. ̈̈тay-©] ' 29 long as I am' \&c. When Jrav has the sense of duration of time, it requires
 the enlightener and the blesser of the world; light being a metaphor both of knowledge and happiness. Sce Esth. viii. 16. Ps. xcvii. 11. exii. 4. Joh. i. 5. This sentiment wan doubtless suggested hy the case of the blind man.















6．є́xтvoc－ioì tuф入oū］The reason why this action，which could contribute nothing to the cure，was employed，will appear from the Notes on Mark vii．33．and viii．23．，and yet more from the Note in Recens．Synop．The speculations of the Commentators here are many of them rather curious than useful．
7．vi\＆at］＇wash thyself，bathe；＇probably the eyes only．So Markl．and Campo．observe that vim only of the body，while dovéty is to wash or bathe the whole body．This distinction is ex－
 is used of him whose whole body is washed，and the verb vi 广 aa 0 al is joined with coos noose．＂ On ко $\lambda \nu \mu \beta \dot{\eta} \theta_{\rho} a$ see Note supra v．2．This order was given to try his faith．
 by Wassenbergh and Kuin．considered as a gloss；but without reason ；since they are omitted only in two Oriental Versions．Now Versions are at best but slender evidence for the omission of clauses little necessary to the sense；and the omission of the present by those who were writing for the use of Oriental readers may be easily ac－ counted for．There can be no doubt but that it is genuine；for such etymological interpretations of names were then very usual；as might be shown by many examples both from the Scrip－ tural and the Classical writers，especially Thu－ cydides；though they have been usually traps in which ignorant or unwary and rash Critics have fallen．See Bornem．Dissertat．de Gloss．N．T． caute dijudicandis．
－ $\bar{j} \lambda \lambda e]$ for $\alpha \nu \eta \bar{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ ；a frequent signification． See Wail．

8．$\tau \cup \phi \lambda \delta \varepsilon$ ］The reading is here uncertain； several antient MSS．，Versions，and some Fathers having $\pi \rho o \sigma a i \tau \eta s$, which is preferred by most Critics and received by almost every Editor from Griesb．to Scholz；but，I conceive，without sup－ ficient ground．Whichever be the true reading， one must be an intentional alteration ；for neither
could be a gloss on the other．Now it seems more probable that $\tau v \phi \lambda$ ．should be altered into $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma a i \tau \eta \mathrm{~s}$ ，than $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma$. into $\tau u \phi \lambda$ ．And I suspect that the former alteration was made by those who took the oft for a causative conjunc－ ton．Thus it is in the Versions rendered qua， or quod．And if that were the right interpreta－ ton，the sense would rather require mpoorairys than тиф入ós．But thus of $\theta$ eco．a．т．т $\rho$ ．will yield a feeble sense；and $\delta \rho \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ would be re－ quired，not $\theta$ ewpoüvт $\epsilon$ ．In short，there can be little doubt but that ignorance or inattention to the Hellenism in oi $\theta$ ccopoüvтes aivizy $\bar{j} \nu$ for of $\theta \in \omega \rho$ ：$\dot{\partial} \tau \iota$ a $\dot{u} \tau \delta s \dot{\eta} \nu$ ，led to the mistake and altera－ ton in question．And surely ruth．is far more suitable in sense than mporaitins．We may render：＇And those who had seen，ascertained， and known him to be blind，＇\＆c．This is men－ toned in order to place the evidence for the miracle in a strong point of view，and show that imposture or collusion was impossible．The Evangelist might，indeed，have written $\tau v \phi \lambda \dot{o}^{\prime}$ sal mporaíns，found in a few MSS．and Latin Versions；but he is not accustomed to be so exact；nor was it necessary，for the latter circum－ stance comes out in the subsequent narration． Those Critics，it should seem，were especially in－ duce to make up the reading $\tau \cup \phi \lambda \dot{d} \mathrm{~s}$ каl $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$ ． ait ns because there is reason to think that $\pi \tau \omega \chi \delta s \tau u \phi \lambda d s$ was a common phrase in Greek， as cacus rogator in Latin；for the blind were almost always beggars．I will only add，that the quarter from which the new reading comes is one from whence have proceeded so many thou－ sands of rash and causeless alterations in other parts of the N．T．The common reading too is confirmed by a seeming allusion to it infra $\mathbf{\nabla}$ ． 18.

 sight and the joy consequent upon it would give a different air to the whole countenance．

11．àvé $\beta \lambda \epsilon \psi a]$ I received sight．See Matt． xiv．19．Mark vi．41，and Notes．


























#### Abstract

13. rows $\boldsymbol{\phi}_{\text {ap. }}$.] i.e. the Sanhedrin, the far greater part of whom were Pharisees. That these were the rulers, is plain from vv. $22 \& 34$. 15. $\mu o v]$. This position of $\mu$ ow instead of that after o $\phi \theta$., is found in most of the best MSS. and early Yd., and is received by almost all Editors from Wets. to Scholz. It is certainly confirmed by a fundamental Critical canon.


 Divine legate.
 no occasion, with Lampe and others, to break up the sentence into two interrogations, ' What sayest thou of him? that he hath opened thine eyes?' For although specious reasons may be adduced in favour of that mode; yet thus the second question would be futile, because it had before been put, and the man had manifestly recovered his sight. It is better, with all the antient and almost all modern Commentators ; to assign the sense : 'What sayest thou of him, in that he hath opened thine eyes, or as to his opening thine eyes? i. e. as Hammond paraphrases, 'What opinion of him hath this work of power and mercy wrought in thee?'
 Noses, (as some Commentators suppose) for that, as Bp . Middlet. has observed, would require the Article. It is plain from vv. 31 \& 36 . that the man considered Jesus only as a prophet, and
probably of the lowest order, certainly not the Son of God. Euthym. rightly explains by $\theta$ cion devin.
18. of 'Iovóaiol] i.e. the \$apıनaiou before
 summoned.'
 Kin., and Tittm. think two questions are here blended into one, i.e. 'Is this your son? Do ye say he was born blind?' That would, indeed, be the more regular manner of expression; but the present is the more simple and natural, and indeed characteristic of the persons; for, in their haste to proceed from interrogation to imputation of fraud, they blurt out the latter (which is inplied in $\lambda \epsilon \boldsymbol{\gamma} \epsilon \tau 6$ ) together with the former. In their answer, the parents pass over the imputation, and consider the words as comprehending two questions, to which they reply.
 of an age sufficient to enable him to answer, of an age fit for evidence ?' Of this phrase the Commentators adduce examples from the best Classical writers.
22. $\sigma v v e \tau \dot{\theta} \theta e \iota v \tau 0]$ Here we have a signification pragnans, ‘ de communi comsilio decrecerant, as in Acts xxiii. 20. On this use of the Pluperf. Pass. in the Middle or Deponent sense, see





















yívqrat, 'should be excommunicated.' There were three degrees of excommunication, the second of which is supposed to be here meant.
 what it might seem to import, ' Give the praise of thy cure to God, and not to Jesus.' For the absence of the Article will not permit that sense; and the words are verbatim a form often employed in the O.T. in order to excite any one to speak the truth. See Josh. vii. 18 \& 19. 1 Sam. vi. 5. Jer. xiii. 16., where, though not a form of adjuration, (as some suppose) it is a serious admonition to speak the whole truth. "For a lie is (as Lampe observes) a denial of the omniscience, holiness, truth, and justice of God: and he who wilfully conceals the truth, or declares a falsehood, insults all those attributes of the Deity." Thus the form was used when a confesion of sins was to be wrung from any one. 'The sense, then, meant to be expressed is,' Confess the truth, dissemble nothing: hast thou been really blind from thy birth, and been healed by him ?' They hoped, by thus tampering with the man, to detect some fraud or collusion.
25. єi d $\alpha$ а $\rho \tau \boldsymbol{} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ós-oi $\delta \alpha$ ] The Commentators are divided in opinion on the scope of these words, in which some recognize dissimulation, others sarcusm. See Recens. Synop. But neither of those views seems well founded. It is better, with Brug., Camer., Grot., and Whitby, to take the words to import, that he has no knowledge of what they allege, $q$. d. That Jesus is a sinner I know not; $\epsilon l$ being put for $\ddot{\sigma} \tau t$. But the authority for this sense of $e l$ is precarious; and $I$ would therefore take oive oido in a prpular sense to denote I give no opinion, I have nothing to do with that. Whether he be a sinner I know nothing, have nothing to do with that.' The idiom is common in our own language. The above view is confirmed by the words following,

İv oiza, which (as Lampe observes) do not imply knowledge of nothing besides, but keeping to one main and principal point.
27. Ti] for кaтa ri, why. Oík pikov́a $\alpha \tau e$,
 are ironical; and to this taunt the Sanhedrim reply by gross abuse.
29. тoü̃ov-d $\sigma \tau i \nu$ A popular form of expression importing, "We know not his divine mission, whether his doctrine and miracles proceed from Divine impulse or dæmoniacal agency.'
30. \&v roú $\left.\frac{1}{0}\right]$ scil. $\mu$ épet, in this circumstance. rajp has here, like the Heb. $\quad>$, the sense sane. Өavuaroóv. Sub. Tt. The word is used like our strange, to denote what is paradoxical and irrational. The $\dot{\mu} \mu$ eis is emphatical. Kal, 'and yet.' The sense is: 'This truly is strange, that you who pretend to distinguish true from false prophets, should not be able to discern with whose power he comes, who gives sight to those born blind.'
31. oi $\delta a \mu \in \nu]$ ]. it is well known.' The following is a sentiment frequent in Scripture, as Ps. $1 \times \mathrm{vi}$. 18. Is. i. 13 . See also Hom. If. a. 218. The sentiment in the clause following is another gnone generalis. And both are intended to be especially applied to the case of false prophets asking countenance from God.
 the world.' See Note on Lu. i. 70. Tis, scil. $d^{2} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ os, any mere man. Though restoration of sight in some cases to those born blind has of late been effected by the improvements of modern surgical art, yet that does not affect the present case; for the restoration in question demands the intervention of the most consummate human skill and labour, and it would be equally a miracle to restore such persons to sight vithout those means.














suppose，with the older Commentators，that there is here any reference to the doctrine of original sin．It may be sufficient to suppose this said on the same principle which prompted the question of the disciples，v．2．Though the best Com－ mentators antient and modern take it as an hyper－ bolical phrase equivalent to scates peccatis．Per－ haps it is a blending of two phrases，ö入os
 which would form the most opprobrious speech that can easily be imagined．
 are not agreed whether this means＇thrust him out of the council chamber，＇or，＇excommuni－ cated him．＇The expression must primarily signify the former；but the latter is suggested， and probably accompanied or followed the fore－ going．

35．wเのтeviesc－Oeoū］Almost all Commenta－ tors regard these words as only importing，＇Dost thou believe in the coming of the Messiah？＇as all pious Jews did．But the mode of address seems to be directed to the state of the man＇s mind，who，though at the time the miracle was worked upon him，and even when brought be－ fore the Sanhedrim，he seems to have regarded Jesus as no more than a prophet，yet，on reflec－ tion，and consideration of the wonderful works Jesus had done，began to think that he must be more than a prophet，and to wish to be his dis－ ciple，and acknowledge him as such．In this view，the words of his answer may be regarded as a refined way of saying，Art thou that per－ sonage ？dost thou sustain that character？Tittrm． here remarks that ulds toü $\theta \in o \bar{u}$ is in the dis－ courses of our Lord and of his Apostles never a name of office，but of divine nature；and he thinks that by vide toû $\theta \in o u$ the man only under－ stood a divine person，and not the Messiah．I have，with almost all Editors from Wets．toScholz． inserted kal from very many of the best MSS．， Versions，Fathers，and early Edd．This omis－ sion（of which many other examples occur at xiv．22．）arose from the verse just below．
39．els $\wedge p / \mu a$ \＆c．］These words were（as Doddr．has seen）spoken for the sake of the by－ standers．The very act of worshipping would be like to draw a crowd of persons about them． On the sense of eis кріда Commentators are not
agreed．The words following will not permit it to be taken（with some）of the last judgment． See also iii．17．xii．47．v．45．Others think the sense is，＇for the purpose of judging［concerning men，showing their condition，and pointing out their duties］．But that signification is not well established ；and the sense yielded would be too feeble for the occasion，and deprive the words of that sting，which what follows shows they were meant to convey．The true sense seems to be tha：assigned by Chrysost．and Euthym．，and adopted by some eminent modern Commentators，
 and separation，＇that men＇s dispositions may be put to the proof．This is quite agreeable to the primitive signification of kpivety，which is to winnow，and，in a general way，to separate， dicide，as an army into ranks．．．See Hom．Il． $\beta .362$ ．So also Xenoph．Mem．iii．1，9．has крi－ עelv toùs aja ${ }^{2}$ oùs кal toùs какоús．

In the words following the＂$\nu \alpha \alpha$ is certainly not causal．But neither is it，as some recent Com－ mentators imagine，eventual．Thut the air of the words dependant upon it will not permit．It is rather，as Euthym．remarks，simply $\quad \eta \lambda \operatorname{co\tau } \tau \kappa \dot{\alpha} \nu$ тои̃ $\mu$ é $\lambda \lambda o n \tau o s$, or（as some modern Commen－ tators say）indicates conser uence．The expres－ sion ol $\mu \dot{\eta}, \beta \lambda$ éroutes signifies（as Euthym． explains）oi סoкоüvтes тuф入ol $\tau \delta \nu$ voüv，those who are thought to be ignorant of Scripture． See supra vii．49．Many，however，interpret， ＇Those who are conscious of their own ignorance and seek instruction．＇By the ol $\beta$ 人＇́㇒óroves are signified the of doкоüyтes $\beta$ 入étecy or $\delta \xi u-$ depкeis，those who were thought to have，and thought they had knowledge，or those who really had knowledge and acquaintance with Scripture． In either case the eyes of their understanding were blinded by unbelief．For＂blind unbelief （says our Christian Poet）is sure to err．＂
40．$\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ Фар．］Sub．тıvés．
41．$\epsilon l$ тvф入ol jiтє］：If ye were［simply］ ignorant．＇Our Lord hints that they labour under a more incurable blindness than that of the common people，whom they despised．The passage may be thus rendered．＇If ye were ［simply］ignorant，your unbelief might be ex－ cusable；but since ye fancy ye are wise，your unbelief remains inexcusable．＇They had every












advantage of coming at the truth, and recognizing Jesus as the Messiah; but they resisted conviction, were wilfully blind, and therefore their sin of unbelief could not but rest upon them unexpiated, and sink them in perdition. 'Amapriav ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ 'Xe! $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ is a phrase signifying to be guilty of any crime, and be liable to punishment for it. It is not a mere Hellenistic idiom; since I find it in Plato iv. p. 70. Bip. o $\mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \times{ }^{\circ}$ какiav каl d éxà díıкiav.
X. 1. seqq. ] Some Commentators think that the discourse in vv. 1-22. was delivered at another time. But the introductory $\alpha^{\prime} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \alpha^{\prime} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\lambda e ́ \gamma \omega \dot{u} \mu i \nu$ is never used at the beginning of a discourse, but is employed to introduce some further remark or admonition. See Joh. v. 24 \& 25. vi. 26 \&c 32. viii. 34, \&c. Besides, v. 21 may be thought to have reference to the blind man. And, what is more, the imputation lately thrown upon our Lord, ix. 24., of his being an impostor, would induce him to take the first opportunity of rebutting the charge, and showing that he sought nothing but the benefit of the people, and would not hesitate to lay down his very life for them. So far from being their seducer, he would be their Saviour. In illustration, our Lord borrows an image from pastoral life. He shows that those teachers alone were worthy of the name of shepherds, who, having learnt of him, should preach his doctrine. In this and other of his discourses recorded by St. John, our Lord was pleased to employ expressions not direct, but highly figurative, in order to adumbrate the nature of his kingdom and its future fortunes, \&rc. \&ic. This, we may imagine, he did from the stupidity of most of his hearers, and in order to draw the attention and quicken the curiosity and diligence of the better informed and disposed. It was also his intent, that afterwards his words being recalled to mind, might be thoroughly understood by all from the event, and thus their comprehension be enlightened, and their faith confirmed.

1. aù $\lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ ] On this word, which means an inclosure formed by hurdles and wicker work,
 is here designated the Jewish paople, who needed the food of spiritual instruction. See Ezek. xxxiv. 11. Jerem. xxiii. 4. sq. By $\dot{d}$ el $\sigma e \rho \chi^{\delta}-$ $\mu \in \nu o s ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ t i j s ~ \theta u ́ p a s ~ \epsilon i s ~ T r i \nu ~ a u ́ \lambda \eta \dot{\eta}$ is meant a teacher regularly introduced into his office by
appointment from Christ; and consequently
 rized. To enter in by the door seems to have been a proverbial expression to denote making a regular ingress. See Arrian cited in Recens. Synop. Thus Christ is called the door, as giving an opportunity of entering into heaven. K $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ е́гтps and $\lambda$ nowris properly differ, as our thief (or pilferer) and robber, (or highwayman), the one referring to private stealing, the other to public and violent robbery. Here, however, they have little or no difference, but being united, have a force greater than either would bear separately. See Hom. Il. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}$. 10
2. $\dot{\delta}$ өupwods] i. e. the under-shepherd in attendance at the door of the aù $\lambda$.
 his orders. Фwע $\bar{n}$ denotes those inarticulate sounds, as whistling, \&c., or certain words, such as were addressed to the animals, as sheep, oxen, and horses, on which see Recens. Synop. The calling them by their names is illustrated by what Wolf and others adduce, proving that antiently names were given not only to horses, oxen, dogs, and cats, but also to shoep.
3. Ė $\left.\kappa \beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \eta\right]$ 'putteth forth;' for there is no
 indifferently used by the LXX. to express the same Hebrew word.

- $̈ \mu \pi \rho o \sigma \theta \epsilon \nu$ aútw̄ mopeúetat] Contrary to the custom which prevails in the West, the Eastern shepherds did always and do still precede their flocks, and lead them by peculiar sounds of the voice. See Ps. xxiii. 2. 1xxvii. 20. lxxx. 1. The custom (no doubt, introduced by the Moors) still continues in Spain. Yet how antient was the practice, at least in the West, for the sheep to go before, and the shepherd follow, may be inferred from the idea suggested by the antient Greek word rpóßacoy. Probably that custom might have prevailed in the great plains of central Asia, from whence came those early colonists of Greece who introduced the Greek language.

5. oúk oliaat] 'do not heed.'
6. mapoumiav] for mapaßo入iv ; for though the words are distinguished in the Classical writers, (the former there signifying a common saying, from otmos, via trita. So our bye uord) yet they were confounded by the Hellenists.





7. On this and the following passage we may remark that it is entirely allegorical. Now all allegory is similitude; but similitude may be considered in various parts; and therefore, in one and the same allegory, a person may be considered in many ways. (Rosenm.) It is rightly observed by Kuin. and Tittm. that there is here not a mere repetition, but an explanation or application of the foregoing example.
Gúpa, like the Hebr. פחת, denotes not only door, but approach, occasion, and opportunity; also he who gices it. The ratio simil. is this: As a man must pass through the door, in order to his making a regular and unsuspected entrance into a sheep-fold; so he must mantain a proper regard to Christ, who would be a true teacher in the Church, and must pass (as it were) through him, or by his authority, into his office. Compare Joh. vi. 35 . xiv. 6.
8. $\pi \rho \delta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \circ \bar{i}]$ These words have perplexed the Interpreters of every age. They are omitted in very many MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Edd., and are rejected by Grot. and Campb., and cancelled by Matth.; but on very precarious grounds. Campb., indeed, is of opinion that the external evidence against them is equal to that for them; and that the internal evidence is decidedly unfarourable to them. But the Doctor's critical scales do not always draw true. Now it is one of the most certain of Critical canons that an omission of words which have occasioned perplexity to Commentators is always to be regarded as suspicious. And there are some reasons which make the validity of this Canon stronger in the Scriptures than in the Classical writers. The omission would here be made to save the honour of Moses and the Prophets, especially as the Manichzans denied their Divine legation. Internal evidence, therefore, is so strong in favour of these words as to balance even an inequality of external, which, however, does not exist. Add to which, that the words are almost necessary to make any tolerable sense. They may then, safely be regarded as genuine. And the only question is what is their true import. Many antient and modern Commentators would take $\pi \rho d$ for $d \nu \tau l$,
 mateds Mov, understanding it of fulse Christs, as Theudas and Judas of Galilee. This is also maintained by others, who take x $\rho$ d in the usual sense before. But the former interpretation is destitute of any foundation in philology; and the latter involves an inadmissible ellipsis, and indeed an anachronism; for the best Commentators are agreed, that it cannot be proved that there uere any false Christs previous to the time of Jesus. And if one such could be found, it would not justify the $\pi$ davers $\boldsymbol{B} \sigma 00$. Lampe and Elsn. seek to remove the difficulty by taking apd in the sense except. But that is utterly unauthorized. Tittm. thinks there is reference
to the Antichrists after the time of Jesus, taking $\dot{\eta} \lambda A$ ov in the sense of the Present, nay Past and Future, and $\eta \kappa o v \sigma a y$ in a future sense. But that the learned Commentators should have seriously propounded so utterly inadmissible an interpretation, is marvellous. One thing is plain, that our Lord could, by no possibility, have meant to include Moses and the Prophets, of whom He every where speaks in terms of the highest reverence. The best (and indeed a most satisfactory solution) of this difficulty is that of Beng., Rosenm., Campb., and Kuin., who think that $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta$ ov is to be taken of time recently past, and up to the present; i.e. 'have come;' and by the term is meant 'have come in the character of teachers of God's people.' In which light our Lord throughout this discourse considers himself, viz. as the supreme spiritual Shepherd, through whose instruction and grace the undershepherds must be admitted into his fold, the Church. "In this view (says Campb.) the words are directed chiefly against the Scribes and Pharisees, considered as teachers, whose doctrine was far from breathing the same spirit with his, and whose chief object was not, like that of the good Shepherd, to feed and protect the flock, but like that of the robber, or of the wolf, to devour them." I would add, that there is no reason to confine the $\eta \lambda \theta$ ov to the Teachers of that time, or a little before. For there is little doubt but that the Teachers (and they were only such, not prophets) under the second Temple for most of the time after the return from Babylon were, a great part of them, (and that is all that ud́v $\boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \mathrm{s}$ may import) rapacious persons. That $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$ is to be taken in this sense, is plain from
 signifies 'have not attended to them [as moral teachers].' This was evident from the dreadful corruption of morals which had infected the whole of society.
 are not agreed whether these words are to be referred to shepherds, (i. e. spiritual pastors) or sheep, i.e. their flock. Lampe and Storr adopt the latter view; and Muller and Kuin. the former, which, they think, is confirmed by the next verse. Others, as Brug., Doddr., and Tittm., take it of both the shepherds and the sheep. And this may be the safest interpretation. But the sudden transitions in the discourses of our Lord, as preserved by St. John, are such as to occasionally render it difficult to speak positively.

Eworioetat and the expressions which follow must be interpreted according to the view taken of the preceding words. They are, however, more suitable to the sheep (i.e. the people) than the shepherds. $\sum \infty \theta$. may thus be interpreted, shall be placed in a state of salvation. And the words elfe入eúgerat- eivpríet form a pastoral image expressive of undisturbed enjoyment of the blessings in question.
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 false teachers;' for this is (as appears from v. 1.) a singular taken for a genus; on which see
 are graphic, (signifying respectively, 'butcher and destroy') and, no doubt, describe what was often done by the roving bands of marauders, who then infested Judra, and who used to destroy what they could not carry off. See Note on Acts xx. 29. The words $\pi$ eficajoy "ex. serve to strengthen the sense of the preceding clause. Пep $\iota \sigma \sigma \delta \nu$ is not, as some imagine, a noun, but an adverb.
 and another confirmation of what was said, introduced, by our Lord's representing himself under the emblem of a good shepherd. By $\dot{\dot{j}}$ тoumì $\dot{\alpha}$ кados many Commentators think is simply meant ' an enlightened teacher.' But to this interpretation it is justly objected by Tittm., that Tooumiv has no where else that sense, but usually involves the notion of gmerning, protecting, taking care of. Thus in the 0.1. kings are often called Shepherds. And in the N.T. поoméves is the name given to the Curatores Ecclesix, otherwise called $d \pi i \sigma \kappa o \pi o t$, as in 1 Pet. ii. 25 . our Lord is called moıu ${ }^{2} \nu$ кal
 expression may, as some Commentators maintain, denote the Messiah, since under that title He is designated in various parts of the Prophets of the O.T.

- $\dot{\delta} \pi о \mu \mu \dot{\eta} \nu-\pi \rho o \beta \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu]$ The phrase $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ ruéval answers to the Hebr. wפy wh, which words in their literal sense, are equivalent to prof undere vitam: but, in use, they generally denote only to hasard one's life. And this sense is here adopted by many of the most eminent Commentators. By the antient and most modern Commentators, however, the former is assigned, and rightly; for though the restricted sense of the phrase is peculiarly suitable to the natural import of the words, yet the full sense is demanded by the figurative one as applied to the Redeemer. Our Lord, indeed, here only hints what at v . 17. he plainly expresses. The sense, then, is: ' As the good shephend hazards his life for his flock, so does the Messiah, represented by the Prophets under that character, lay down his life for his spiritual flock, the
human race.' There is plainly an allusion to the great doctrine of the Atonement.
12 . $\dot{\delta} \mu$ ucolutios $\delta \dot{\theta}$ \&c.].] This is said in order to illustrate the character of the good shepherd by contrast with the bad, who is called a hireling, not because all hirelings are unfaithful, but that they are generally more or less such.
 $\dot{\Delta}$ кai $\partial s$ before, denote a whole class of persons. And Lampe, Kuin., and Tittm. righty suppose that the Ecclesiastical rulers of that time are meant, as at v. 8. This sudden transition from one metaphor to another is Hebraic. See Kuin. By the term $\mu$ aco $\theta_{\omega \tau 0}$ is perhaps also denoted their avarice, and preference of the honours and emoluments of their office to discharging its duties.

14. $\left.\gamma \iota \nu \omega \dot{\sigma} \kappa \omega-\frac{f}{\epsilon} \mu \nu \bar{\omega}\right]$ These words figuratively designate the mutual love and attachment of the great Shepherd and his spiritual flock. Compare v. 15 with 17. A lively pastoral image is here presented.
 mentators have long been agreed, that these words are closely connected with the preceding, (from which they are unnaturally disjoined by the division of verses) being an illustration by similitude of what was said in the preceding verse. The kal following may be rendered imi, yea.

- тiv $\psi u \times \dot{\eta} \dot{\nu}-\pi \rho о \beta \dot{\alpha} \tau \infty \nu]$ Our Lord here applies what he had already said of a good shepherd, to himself, and openly declares, that he shall offer up his life for men, and for their salvation. See Rom. iii. 6. By what means and how that death is available to the salvation of men, we are not clearly informed. We may, however, imagine it to be as follows. Our Lond describes the sheep for whom he lays down his life as being in extreme peril ; (see v. $10 \& 12$.) and St. Paul calls those for whom Christ died, weak, sinful, \&c., but to be preserved from wrath. Thus in Matth. xx. 28. where our Lord
 то入入ळ̄̃. Now $\lambda$ útpol denotes the price of redemption, i.e. the money given, or the sacrifice offered, by which any one may be redeemed from peril and punishment, and what may be given, 1. for another, in his place and in his stead: 2. that the other should be liberated from
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punishment ; 3. that it should be sufficient, and not require any other price. See Is. liii. 10. Now it is hence plain what was the purpose of the death of Christ, and for what causes he laid down his life. He died, 1 . in the place and stead of men : 2. to obtain their liberation from the punishment of $\sin$, or to obtain pardon of their sin ; 3. that his death should be sufficient to obtain the pardon of sin. Those therefore are in grievous error, who maintain that Christ died only to confirm the truth of his doctrines, or the certainty of the promises respecting the grace of God, and the pardon of sin ; since for neither of these purposes would the death of Christ have been necessary. Nay, the truth and certainty of both are sufficiently established from other proofs; neither does our Lord say that he lays down his life for his doctrine, but for his sheep. Hence it is clear that our Lord called himself room $\dot{y}$, not inasmuch as he was an enlightened and holy teacher of religion; but in a far sublimer sense, namely, inasmuch as by his death he obtained the pardon of sins, and the salvation of men. (Titty.) To this full and sound explanation, I have only to add, that the lax dogmas of some recent heresiarch are strongly contrasted with the uncontaminated orthodoxy of an Apostolic Father, as follows: 'Eva ai $\boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{r} \boldsymbol{y} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\rho o \sigma}-$




 men Rom. I Exist. ad Corinth. $\$ 49$.

16. ala тоóßara-тaúrทs] The Jews and Gentiles are here represented under the image of two different flocks inclosed in separate folds. By the $\dot{\boldsymbol{A}} \lambda \lambda a$ m $\rho \delta \beta \beta a \tau a$ are designated the Gentiles; and by rips aúlj̄s тaúrỵs, the Jews. 'A yayeìv is for sporarayeì, bring to [this fold]. Ayers and its derivatives are frequently employed as pastoral terms. Our Lord calls the Gentiles his sheep, by prolepsis, because he had marked them as his own, was about to lay down his life for their salvation, and foresaw that many would shortly embrace his religion, which be expresses in the words Tiv $\phi$ solis $\mu \mathrm{Nu}$ dкovigovgt. "Thus (says Titty.) our Lord predicts the future admission of the Gentiles to the Christian flock, and the joint participation of them and
the Jews in the blessings obtained by him, under one and the same Lord, so that he might be the author of salvation not to one only, but to all the nations of the universe." Mia signifies one only, one and the same, namely, in having (whatever may be their diversities) the same common Saviour.
 mentators are agreed that the $7 \nu \alpha$ is not causal, or denoting end and purpose, but declarative of the future, or the event, and is to be rendered it amen ut.
17. oúdels aipet aúpiv dis' ¿ $\mu \mathrm{ou}]$ ' no one taketh it from me,' i. e. by force. On the voluntary death of Christ see Notes on Math. xvi.21. We may paraphrase the whole passage thus. 'No one, not even the Father, compelleth me to die for my flock. I have, of my own will, undertaken to lay down my life for it. By the same will I shall return again to life.'

- тaúrqu-watpós nov] 'This charge received I from my Father.' In this whole passage our Lord affirms that he is about to undertake death spontaneously; that the malice of those who may plot against his life could avail nothing, were it not decreed that he should undergo death for the salvation of his people; that no force could take away his life, if he were unwilling to part with it; that he freely lays down that life for the salvation of his flock; and that if they shall kill him, it will not be without his own consent. He asserts, moreover, that he lays down his life, so, however, as to receive it back; and therefore that his death is not to be considered as coming under the common law of mortality, by which all that go down to the tomb return to the dust ; but that it is altogether peculiar to itself; since, after a few days, he will rise from the sepulchre and return to life. He then affirms that his death happens not by any fate or necessity, but by the definite counsel of his Father. (Tittm.)
 Note.
raüra-daınonıy.] "These are neither the words nor the works of a demon.'

22. Ta djкaivia] The word answers in the Sept. to the Hebr. Tr, hardselling or initiation; and in the N.T. denotes the encænium or festi-
${ }_{5}$ Supr. 5.








val of eight days, occurring in the month Kisleu, instituted by Judas Maccabæus in commemoration of the purification of the Temple from Heathen pollution. Unlike all other festivals, which were kept only at Jerusalem, this was celebrated throughout the whole country. And as lights were kept burning in every house throughout each night of the festival, it is called by Josephus, Ant. xii. 7, 7., ф $\bar{\omega} \tau \alpha$.
 mentators take $x \in!\mu \omega \nu$ to denote rainy or wintry weather, as in Matt. xvi.3. Acts xxvii. 20. Ezra x. 9. But there the sense is, a storm, or tempest. And the signification wintry weather, though it is not unfrequent in the Classical writers, as Thucyd. iv. 6. \& vi. 2., yet does not occur in the Scriptural ones, nor is there any good reason to abandon the common interpretation, 'it was winter.' This circumstance might, as Beng. suggests, be added for the information of those readers who knew not the time of the feast.
23. roû $\Sigma o \lambda$.] The roû is omitted in some MSS. and early Edd., and is cancelled by almost all Editors from Matthei to Scholz. But the authority is insufficient to warrant that, especially as it violates the propriety of language, by which the Article is either prefixed to both the governing and governed nouns, or else is omitted before both. As little reason is there to cancel the rois before ' 1 eporo $\lambda$. just before, as many Editors have done.

This porch was called Solomon's, as having been built by Solomon, being the part of Solomon's temple left undestroyed by the Babylonians, and therefore allowed to remain, though in a dilapidated state. There were porticos erected all round the temple; but this fronted the East. Such were common in the Heathen temples likewise, and were erected for the accommodation of the priests and worshippers in general, both for walking in inclement weather, (So Cebes, cited by Wets. ; èтvyxdyouev тєрь-
 purpose of Teachens communicating oral instruction to their followers, from which circumstance one principal Sect of Philosophers, namely, the Peripatetics derived its name.
24. alpers Some eminent modern Commentators explain this, 'Dost thou trifle with, deceive us with vain hopes?' But there is no reason to abandon the interpratation of the antient and most modern ones, 'dost thou keep us in suspense ?' Euthym. well explains : alcopeis, dyap-
 sense I know no example in any Classical writer except that of Philostr. cited by Blackwall;

latin suspendere is often used in this sense, and draipecv frequently occurs in the sense to buoy up with hope.
25. eimov $\dot{v}$.] 'I have told you [who I am],' i. e. the Son of God.

- $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma a-\dot{\epsilon} \mu o \bar{u}]$ The sense is: "[Nay] the works (i.e. the miracles) which I do by the authority of my Father, these bear witness of me [that I am sent by Him].' Of this figurative use of $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho \in i \nu$, Wets. adduces an example from Heraclid. de Deo: "Bןza dei maptupeiv,

 maprus-oi $\rho \alpha \nu d s$ maprupla. With this I would compare the sublime commencement of the 19th Psalm: "The Heavens declare the glory of God" \&cc., on which see the admirable Note of Dr. French and Mr. Skinner. This authority from God, however, our Lord had, not as a mere legate, but as being partaker of the Divine attributes. See v. 17. 8q.

26. ov $\gamma \alpha^{\prime} \rho$ єб $\%$ \&c.] This suggests the cause of their unbelief, namely, that they are not of his flock, will not suffer themselves to be brought into it, nor are willing to acquire the proper dispositions for it. With the words кa日wis citay ${ }_{j} \mu \hat{\nu}$ Commentators are somewhat perplexed, since Chist had no where before told them that they were not his sheep. To remove this difficulty, some antient Critics, it seems, cancelled the clause; for to no other quarter can we well trace the omission of it in several antient, but altered, MSS. and some Versions. Nor is it easy to believe, what some modern Critics aver, that the words were foisted in by the scribes; nay it is incredible that such a clause, by no means necessary to the sense, should have crept into nearly all the MSS. As to Versions, they are not good authority for omissions, and especially of what is perplexing. There can be no doubt that the clause is genuine; and though we find nothing of this kind said in our Lord's preceding discourses, yet may it not have reference to something said, not recorded, by St. John ? This is preferable to supposing, with some, that it was indirectly expressed, i.e. implied, in our Lord's words. However, as there can be no doubt that there is a reference to the preceding discourse of the good shepherd, (for our Lord now proceeds to resume the allegory) and since, though our Lord does not there use these words, but does, in fact, say (v.3.) that 'his sheep hear his voice;' so it is probable, that $\kappa a 0 \omega s$ \&c. belong to those words, and should therefore be joined with the following verse, as in some MSS., Versions, and Euthym., with the approbation of Pearce, Campb., Vat., and others.














27．тทิs фшעทิs $\mu$ au $\alpha \kappa$ ．］i．e．give heed to， obey my commands．By та̀ тро́ßата та̇ doa are meant such of the sheep as acknowledge their shepherd．Fıvш́⿱亠䒑𧰨心，I acknowledge them as mine，provide for their welfare．See v．14，and Matt．vii．23．＇Aкo入ouӨoū it $\mu \circ$ ，i．e．in faith and obedience．See Joh．xvii． 2.

28．on $\mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \pi o ́ \lambda \omega \nu \tau a \iota$ cis $\operatorname{T} \delta \nu$ alw̄va］The language（which is as strong as can be con－ ceived）is thus paraphrased by Tittm．：＇At no time，neither in this life，nor in death，nor after death，to all eternity，shall any thing happen to them that shall deprive them of salvation．＇See Joh．viii．51．xiii．8．The words following cal
 braism）are confirmatory of the above promise； and in the next verse is suggested the reason why no one can snatch these faithful disciples from him，namely，that the Father hath delivered them to him，in order to be preserved and re－ deemed；that omnipotent Being in whom are the issues of life and death，both temporal and spi－ ritual．The whole passage bears strong attesta－ ion to the Divinity of Christ ；but gives，when properly understood，no countenance to the doctrine，that the elect can never fall away and perish；having，in truth，no relation to personal election，or final perseverance．
30．${ }^{d} \gamma^{\omega}{ }^{\circ}-\dot{d} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ On the exact sense of ${ }^{2} \nu$ dopey Commentators are not agreed．Some antient and most modern ones understand them of unity of will，purpose，counsels，and works． This they support from Joh．xvii．21－23．，and especially from the verse preceding．But so sudden are the transitions，and so excursive the thoughts in our Lord＇s discourses as contained in this Gospel，that the argument drawn from thence is fallacious．By far the greater part of the antient and earlier modern Commentators understand the words of physical unity of essence， including moral unity．This，indeed，Lampe has shown，was the opinion of almost every one of the Orthodox Fathers．Tittm．，however， while he as strenuously rejects the former inter－ pretation，declines embracing the latter，and takes the words of unity of energy and porer． And indeed this is strongly countenanced by the preceding context．For（as Titty．argues）1． our Lord at v．28．attributes the same to himself
as to his Father．2．He shows the reason why nothing can be taken from the Father，namely， because He is all powerful．3．A reason is added why nothing can be taken from Him any more than from his Father，because they are one，viz． in the work of power，\＆c．This，Tittm．argues， implies union of attributes；and he maintains that hence we may infer that where there is one and the same divine power and attributes，there is one and the same divine nature．According to the other interpretation，unity of essence in－ cludes unity of attributes，will，\＆c．Thus whichever interpretation be adopted，the words can import no less than a claim to equality with the Father（and consequently prove the Deity of our Lord）just as the passage at viii．58．which and the present the Jews so understood，other－ wise they would not have attempted to stone him for blasphemy，with the words $\sum \dot{d} \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi=s$
 aught but God one with the Father，common candour and ingenuousness would have required him to disavow the interpretation they put upon his words．

31．¿ $\beta$ agora $\sigma a \nu]$＇took up．＇This significa－ ion is thought to be Hellenistic；but I have，in Recens．Synop．，adduced two examples from Antiphanes and Josephus．
 is：＇Many benefits have I conferred upon you．＇ The if ya relates not only to the wonderful and salutary miracles exhibited by Jesus，but also to his whole course of action in promulgating the Gospel of grace．${ }^{\text {＇E }} \mathbf{\delta \in \iota} \xi_{a}$ may，indeed，seem to have reference most to miracles；but it often in the Classical writers simply means edere，pres－ tare，to perform．Of which Wets．cites powerful examples，to which I have in Rec．Syn．added others．＇Ex тoü ratpós $\mu$ ．signifies＂by the aid of，in virtue of，the powers vested in me by my Father．
－$\lambda_{t} \theta_{\alpha}^{\prime} \zeta_{\varepsilon \tau \epsilon]}$＇are stoning，＇i．e．going to stone．
 the charge of blasphemy our Lord，for reasons which it were irreverent too nicely to scan，was pleased not to fully disclose his intimate con－ junction with the Father，and why be called God his Father，and himself the Son of God．
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He contents himself with using a sort of argiment quite in the Jewish style, (and therefore adapted to make an impression on the hearers) arguing with them on the ground of what they themselves admitted, namely, that He was a Prophet sent from God; and showing that, even on that supposition, he had a right to the title which they refused him. Our Lord alludes to Ps. Ixxxii. 6, where Judges and magistrates are called Elohim, sons of the most high God.
 words are best explained by Tittm. thus: "to whom was delivered the command mentioned just before, namely, to plead the cause of the destitute \&c. The words кal ò dívataı $\lambda u \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a \iota ~ \eta ो$ ypaфri are to be taken in a restricted sense, to signify, 'And the Scriptures cannot be taken exception to,' cannot be thought wrong."
 той $\Theta$ eoū ; for $\dot{\text { árıáYecı, like the Hebr. }}$. nifies to set apart from common use to a sacred purpose. It is justly remarked by Tittm. that our Lord did not (as the Socinians say) argue thus to signify that he was to be called God and Son of God in no other sense than that in which those judges were so styled, namely, with respect to office ; much less to decline the application of the word in the same sense as of the Father; as is evident from what precedes. He merely uses an argument ab exemplo (what the Philosophers call an instance) and argues ab concessis, q. d. Magistrates are called divine, and sons of God, without injury to the Deity: nay God himself hath so called them. May not I then, by a similar right, be so called, whom God bath sent into the world, and to whom he hath committed a charge so salutary to the human race. That the Gentiles used to bestow on great men the title of gods, is proved and illustrated with many examples by Lampe and Wets.

37,38. The sense of the passage (which is expressed mare Judaico) is simply this: 'That 1 am Son of God, the Messiah, and am most closely united with the Deity, my works show;
q. d. If I had not done the same works which my Father doth, ye might refuse credit to my words: but since they bear the same stamp, you should at least believe them, if you will not believe my words; and then you would understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father.' By these words our Lord has manifestly declared himself to be the Son of God, not in that sense in which the Jewish Rulers were so called, but in a more sublime one; not in respect to the office he sustains, but the nature which he bears, since he does the same works as the Father. (Tiltm.)
 Tittm. remarks) indicate generally intimate connexion, and here, by the force of the context, conjunction of one and the same energy. The Father was in the Son, the Son in the Father; inasmuch as the Son hath the same as the Father, and can do, and doth, the same with the Father; just as in v. 17. "As my Father worketh, so 1 work." See Bulli Opera, p. $39 \& 40$.
39. $\left\langle\xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta_{e \nu}\right]$ 'subduxit se.' It is not necessary to dwell so much, either one way or the other, as some Commentators do, on this expression, which simply means 'he escaped out of their hands.' See Note on viii. 59.
40. тépay тoü 'Iopo.] i.e. Bethany, on the side of the Jordan, and situated in the wilderness of Judæa; a safe resort. "E $\mu \epsilon \tau \nu e \nu$ גккeĩ, ' abode there;'. which, however, does not preclude the supposition of Lampe and Tittm. that he took, during the four months of his sojourn there, some journies into Peræa.
41. ©nerov \&cc.] 'They reasoned thus: John worked no miracle, yet we believed in his divine mission. And now we see it amply proved by the miracles worked by Him to whom John professed to be a forerunner.'
XI. The Evangelist now proceeds to narrate the closing scenes of our Cord's life, what is related in this Chapter having taken place only a few days before the Passover on which he suffered death. The raising of Lazarus being a
















work of all that Christ had hitherto done the most stupendous，was studiously recorded by the Evangelist，as illustrating the majesty of our Lord．No wonder therefore that infidels and sceptics should have used every exertion to destroy its credibility．Their cavils，however， have been triumphantly refuted by Lardner and others，and the quibbling objections of the Ra － tionalists of our own times have been satisfactorily overruled by the best Theologians both British and foreign．

1．$\alpha \sigma \theta \in \mathrm{Ev} \mathrm{E}$ ］The word is used not only of in－ disposition，but also of dangerous illness，whether acute or chronic ；as Yen．Anat．i．1．Mat．x． 8. Lu．iv．40．vii．10．The pressing invitation sent by the two sisters shows that Lazarus was in imminent danger．＇$A \pi d \operatorname{B} \eta \theta$ ．，i．e．an inhabitant of Bethany．The is just after is used in a similar way；and the use of both，where one would have sufficed，is characteristic of St．John．On this family，see Note on Lu．x． 40.
2．jj d入ei千qaaj Said，by anticipation，for ＇who afterwards anointed．＇The figure is not unusual where the action（as here）speedily fol－ lowed，and was well known．See Matt．xxvi． 13. On this circumstance see Note on Matt．xxvi． 6 ．
 －will not finally terminate in death．＇Such is the best interpretation of this dubious expression， which it is more judicious to consider as a popular form，than to suppose that by death is meant the decretory death by which all must return to earth．The Classical writers use in
 sense is：＇but is meant to illustrate the glory of God，＇namely，by the Son being thereby glorified． See ix． 3 ．
The best Commentators antient and modern are，with reason，agreed in considering this verse as the answer sent by our Lord to the sisters． ＂Our Lord（says Euthym．）sent this predictive answer in order to comfort them．But he himself staid sometime longer，waiting till Lazarus should actually expire and be buried；that no one might
say that he had raised him when not yet dead， but only in a fainting fit，or trance．
 to Bethany till Lazarus had been dead four days． See v． 17.
 though expressive of wonder，are dissuasive，and were suggested by some fear for Jesus，notwith－ standing their conviction of his divine power to save himself，and also by some apprehension for their own safety．

9．out ${ }^{l} \dot{\text { ósideka－rimépas］The Jews（by a }}$ reckoning adopted from the Greeks）divided the day，or the time while the sun is above the ho－ rizon，into twelve hours，of course varying a little according to the season of the year．
 here meant to be conveyed the Commentators are not agreed．The best view seems to be that taken by Comer．，Peace，and Doddr．，and further unfolded by Mir．，Rosenm．，Kin．，and Tittm．， namely，that the words are a parabolical enigma， （more（）rientali）but imperfectly expressed，the application being left to be supplied by the hearer，as in Virgo．Esl．ii．18．Alba ligustra cadunt，vaccinia nigra leguntur．The preceding words oil $\dot{\text { бíjecka }}$ \＆c．suggest a gnome generalist，
 yarat＇pya\} ~ c o r a l . ~ T h e ~ s e n s e , ~ t h e n , ~ i s : ~ ' T h e r e ~ is a certain and stated time for work；the day is that time．Now is my day，now my business must be done，when alone it can be done success－ fully．＇This is，no doubt，the full sense ；and therefore the piety rather than judgment of Eu－ thymus＇s exposition（ap．Rec．Syn．）is to be commended．
With respect to the phraseology itself，at mog－ ко́ттєt sub．nóòa（which is expressed in Matt． iv．6）and also eve or some other Dative，which is found in some passages of Xenoph．and Acis－ toph．cited in Recons．Synop．Td ф wis tout co $\sigma \mu$ vv is regarded by the Commentators as a periphrasis for $\tau \dot{d} \nu$ クỉiov．But the expression rather signifies the light which is shed abroad in













 is destitute of light ;' as xii. 35 .
 ing the reason why he must go, Jesus expressed himself first figuratively, and then distinctly and clearly. In кexot 4 . there is a euphemism denoting death, common to all languages; but by it the sacred writers especially adumbrate the death of the righteous. The disciples, however, (partly misled by their wishes) misunderstood our Lond: although he had expressed himself with respect of the young maiden whom he restored to life. And there appears a sort of beautiful propriety, that He who was to " perfume the grave" and triumph over death, should already adapt his language to what his power should effect, and bid u an not look on the dark and carnal side of death, but to that placid sleep which to his faithful servants should precede a glorious rising again to enter into the joy of their Lord.
 sleep, be will recover. Perhaps a sort of adage founded on experience. Thus the Rabbis mention sleep among the six good symptoms in sickness ; and many passages are adduced by Wets. from the Classical writers, lauding its beneficial effects in sickness. The disciples seem to have intended to hint that as Lazarus was likely to recover, there was no occasion to hazard himself in Judea.
14. Ad Sapor dxidave] Our Lorn now declares in plain terms "Lazarus is dead." The knowledge of this circumstance can be ascribed to nothing but omniscience. In the words following Jesus hints at what he had already plainly said, v.11., namely, that he was going to raise Lazarus from the dead.
 Trorevionte are not, as many Commentators suppose, parenthetical; but there is a a transposetron in the construction. "H $\mu \eta \nu$ for ${ }^{\text {In }} \boldsymbol{j}$ is is a form found only in the later writers. See Lobeck on Pry. p. 15S. Dior. is here used of that completenese of faith in Christ, which, it seems, the disciples had not yet all attained.
16. d $\lambda$ erópevor $\Delta$.] The best Commentators tale thin as an interpretation of $\theta_{\text {ounce }}$, i.e. orin. But some, as Tittrm, think it expresses a

this view is confirmed by Nonnus and Sedulius, and is, with reason, embraced by Mr. Rose on Parkh. But when he says that turin is doubtless derived from the Hebr. ono, he writes what would be worthier of Parkhurst than his learned, acute, and judicious Editor. The words being, as he urges, so "alike in sense" is no reason why one should be derived from the other. Mr. Roe will not, on consideration, for a moment doubt that twin comes from the Ang. Sax. Tainan, to twist or twine ; and signifies a fates entwined in utero with another, ora rd oúvapa غंтépey yepעท易val, to use the words of Euthyri.

- äconcy-airoi] On the sense of these words the Commentators are not agreed. Some would take them interrogatively. But that is doing violence to the construction. The only doubt is whether aivoi is to be referred to $L_{a-}$ varus, or to Jesus. Now most eminent modern Commentators adopt the former method; but it does not yield so natural a sense as the latter, which is supported by the ancient and many, modern Interpreters, including Calvin, Maldon., Lampe, Doddr., Titty., and Kuin. Thomas, keenly alive to the danger both Jesus and themselves would incur by going into Judea, exclaims with characteristic, but well meant bluntness: "Since our Master will expose himself to such peril, let us accompany him, if it be only to share his fate! !"

17. didowiv] having arrived, ie. not at Bethan itself, but at the vicinity, whither Martha, hearing of his approach, had gone to meet him ; and met with him, it seems, not far from the burying ground, such being always outside of a city or town. "Exovra \&cc. "BXeay, when used. as here, of time, signifies agere, transigere ; an idiom frequent in the Classical writers. The four days (observes Lamps) seem to be reckoned from the burial of Lazarus; though at v. 39. the reckoning is made from his death. The interval. however, between death and burial among the Jews was extremely short, generally only a few hours. The th day was probably only begun, not completed.
18. ia d oradicey, ס.] Render: 'it being at about 15 stadia off.' There is here (as Kypke shows) an ellis. of $\gamma$ yououiv, which is expressed in Appian, p. 793. And he adduces examples of this absolute use of ind (which may be compared with our off) from several of the later writers.




















19. 'Iovoaimy] Chiefly, we may suppose, the Jerusalemites from the extreme vicinity. Tais тepl M. каi M. The best Commentators, ancient and modern, are of opinion that this is simply for spot Mápoav кal M. The idiom is common in the Classical writers; but it does not always mean the person only, but sometimes includes those about him, relations, or near friends. And as at Acts xiii. 13. oi Tupi tod $\Pi$ חaü入ov denotes ' Paul and his companions,' so here it may mean - Martha and Mary with their relations.' These visits of condolence were usual among the Jews, and extended to seven days after the funeral. The number of persons here mentioned became the means of making the miracle generally known, and establishing its reality.
20. cor yкourav] ' as soon as she had beard;' no doubt from some travellers on horseback, who had passed Jesus on the road. 'By ref oi. dкaO., ' was sitting at home ; or, as Camp. renders, 'remained at home.' Though there may be, as Lampe and Doddr. think, an allusion to the sifting posture appropriate to grief, which Lampe illustrates from the Classical writers.

22-24. I agree with those Commentators who think from these words, that Martha had a persuasion (though it might be feeble) that Jesus could, and an expectation, though faint, that he would raise her brother from the dead.
 reaction common to all.
25. trass elms yo aंváatagts \&c.] Here our Lord, by a common figure of the effect for the efficient, professes that $H$ e is the author of the resurrection of the dead; and as be shall sometime raise all the dead, so he can and will now raise Lazarus to life.

- Yiंबerat] The sense is, 'shall be raised to
a life of felicity and glory. Katy גxodayy, 'though he die,' i. e. must die.
 to engraft on the foregoing assurance another expressed in yet stronger terms, and denoting something more, namely, that the gift shall be not only of life in a figurative, but in a physical sense, and that never ending: ' 0 Y $\zeta_{\bar{\omega}}^{\boldsymbol{\nu}}, 1$ conceive, signifies 'whoever while alive,' showing that the chance for obtaining, what is added is suspended on the issue of the life on earth. The Commentators assign other, but less probable, senses.

27. oi ii it Xpıotds-Oeoū] Martha mentions, in the fulness of her devotion, both the titles designating the expected Messiah in Scriptare. Titum. thinks that she understood by the latter something more exalted than the former, namely, one united in the Godhead, and in whom are centred all the essential attributes of God. Be that as it may, Martha certainly did not understand by it a term of office, not nature. Though even if she did, the opinion of an uninspired individual could prove nothing on that point, on which we are at issue with the
 the world,' i. e. who, the Scriptures say, is to come.
28. $\left.\lambda \alpha^{\prime} \theta \rho a\right]$ In the calling for her secretly, i. e. separately from the visitors of condolence in the bouse, is implied that she spoke to her apart. It seems she had Jesus's directions to call her, though the Evangelist has not recorded it. Jesus, no doubt, directed it, in order that Mary might be a spectator of the miracle.
29. Ireipera، Taxi] Not only out of reveronce to Jesus, but from her faith, which was invigorated by the alacrity of her sister.
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 of both Jews and Gentiles to repair to the cemeteries to weep at the tombs of their departed friends.
30. èveßpıцทiбato] On the exact sense of this word Commentators are not agreed. The term would, according to its usual sense both in the Scriptural and the Classical writers, signify indignutus est. And so many of the most eminent Commentators explain it. But (as Titty. observes) there was no apparent ground for censure. We must take the word (with Camb., Roeenm., Schl., and Titty.) of violent internal commotion excited by sorrow, as the Hebr. and 1 Sam. xv. 11: Indeed $\beta$ pis $\mu \infty$, (from which the word is derived) like its cognate fremo, simply denotes only the commotion of any one of the violent passions. The view of the sense taken by Euthym. and Maldon., (See Recens. Synop.) who suppose the sense to be 'he repressed his spirit or emotion,' is very ingenious, and would deserve attention, were it not for the
 admit of no other interpretation than the one which I have here adopted, and which is much confirmed by the words following cal érdpakev ciavoiv, which are exegetical of the foregoing, and in which we have an example of reciprocal
 rats will signify ' in his spirit,' as it is explained by Middles. Gr. Art.
31. The iтékeito does not import, as strict propriety of language requires, that the entrance was from above, since the researches of Anti-
quarries show that it was, in the case of Jewish tombs, rather from the side. Hence we may see the suitableness of the Hebrew term to denote the stone which closed up the entrance, namely, ,
 rather adapted to the customs of the Greeks, than the Jews.

- objet] "OKe! $\nu$ signifies properly to emit an odour, whether good, (as in Aristoph. ap. Suid.) or bad, as here and in other passages in the LXX. and Classical writers adduced by Wets.
- тeтaptaĩos $\gamma d \rho$ edo $\iota]$ Of this Greek idiom, by which what properly belongs to the person, is applied to the thing, many examples are adduced by Raphel, and Wets. It seems by these words that Martha thought Jesus meant no more, by ordering the stone to be removed, than to take a last look at the countenance of his friend. The Commentators remark on the inconsistency of this with her late profession of faith. But (alas for human nature!) are there not, in cases similar to the present, such inconsistencies. produced by the struggles between faith and rebelling nature, in the most pious persons?

41. oū] Sub. тoû $\mu \nu \eta \mu e i o u$.

- eire IIdrep \&ce.] The words of this prayer are, from high wrought pathos, very brief, and consequently obscure. Hence their full sense is only to be expressed in a paraphrase. Titty. gives the following. ' I thank thee, $\mathbf{O}$ Father, that thou hast always heard my secret prayers, and I know that thou wilt always hear




 аüтồ бо⿱亠⿻⿰丨丨八又一













them，since thy will is the same as mine；but now I pray aloud，on account of the people which stand by，that they may believe that thou hast sent me．＇This，however，seems too lax． I would propose the following：＇Father，I thank thee that thou usest to hear my prayers．I know that thou dost continually hearken to my wishes ［whether expressed，or only mental］；but I have［now］spoken［them］because of the maul－ titude present，that［by their seeing the granting of my desire］they may know that thou hast sent me．＇The best Commentators are agreed that in ท̈кovaras the Aorist expresses，as often，what is customary．＂H．$\delta \in t y$ in a Present sense is common． An ellipsis after $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ is very frequent，on which see Hoogev．de Part．
 suppose，with most Commentators，that the whole body was involved in the bandages；for thus a second miracle would be requisite．But，as miracles are not to be supposed without sufficient reason， we may imagine that the sheet（atvoiw）in which the body was wrapped，was not so tightly brought together by the bandages whereby the armlets were kept in their places，but that Lazarus was enabled to creep forth．See an apposite passage of Apuleius adduced（from Wets．）in Recens． Synop．
－roudapiẹ］kerchief．This did not cover the face，but was brought under the chin．
－$\lambda$ úgare］i．e．＇loosen the bandages．＇On the credibility of this stupendous miracle，see an able Critic，Tittm．in Rec．Syn．

47．Ti rocoūuev；］This is best rendered， －What are we doing？＇A popular phrase fitted to deliberation，and implying also＂What are we to do？＂$\sum_{n \mu e i ̃ a . ~ T h e y ~ a d m i t t e d, ~ i t ~ s e e m s, ~ t h e ~}^{\text {en }}$ miracles of Jesus，but yet refused faith，on some
such groundless pretence as，that they were effected by Diabolical agency．
48．Tónov］Not the Temple，as some explain； for that would require roütov rod rózov；but the city of Jerusalem．Though Kuin．takes it of the country．Alpert，like the Hebr．mes，is used of destroying either a city or country．

49．úpeīs oúk otiare oùdív］These words，and the counsel afterwards given，correspond so little to the foregoing ones，that almost all the best Commentators are of opinion，that something which immediately preceded them in the delibera－ tions has been omitted by the Evangelist．This， however，is a principle always precarious，and generally objectionable，and is here（as usual） unnecessary．May we not consider the words of the Evangelist，Ti Totoū two n opinions pronounced by two different parties of the Sanhedrin；ti тосо̂̀uev－moteī by those who were inclined to think well of Jesus，éaंv dфшінev－$\theta$ nos by those who thought nothing about the truth or the falsehood of Jesus＇s pre－ tensions，but，viewing the thing solely in a political point of view，were alive to the dan－ ger of letting him go on，and thought he must be put down，but scrupled at mentioning the means．Against both these，each in a cer－ tain sense，the rebuke of Caiaphas is directed， the sense of which is：＂Ye are foolish and raw！namely，in state craft，by seeing what is expedient to be done，and yet scrupling at the means．＇
 maxim of state policy，that the safety of the whole nation is to be preferred to one individual．＇See Recens．Synop．With respect to the phraseology， we have here a Positive with cal $\mu$ r instead of a Comparative with ${ }_{\eta}$ ．
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61. тoüto $\delta \&$ - 0 yous] The common interpretation is, that in these words Caiaphas, though a very bad man, yet, in virtue of his Sacerdotal office, unknowingly, and unintentionally, in fact, prophesied that Jesus should die for the Jewish people, \&c. and should thus collect the true worshippers of God everywhere. And though many recent Commentators stumble at the $\pi \rho o e \phi$. being ascribed to so bad a man as Caiaphas, yet (as Kuin. observes) his office rather than his person must be regarded. And we need only refer to the case of Balaam and others. Kuin. takes mpoe $\phi$. to mean 'he, as it uere, attered a divine prediction, so that he might seem to have predicted what did really occur. This, however, is paring down the sense. I cannot but agree with Lampe, Kypke, Rosenm., and Tittm., that тоoeф. imports divino instinctu locutus est, Deo ita dirigente, as Lu.i. $67 \& 76$. This is clear from the antithetical expression d' $\phi^{\prime}$ '̇autoû eirev. Caiaphas, then, so spoke that, by Divine Providence, the words which he meant as merely a politic counsel, proved a sort of prophecy concerning the death and vicarious atonement of Christ. The ठ̈r Kuin. and others would render for. But that sense is scarcely permitted by propriety of language ; nor is it very necessary.
52. кal obx $\dot{u \pi} \in \rho-c i s$ ëv] These words are a further enlarging on the same subject. Evvárect els $\begin{aligned} & \nu \nu \\ & \text { scil. } \sigma \omega \bar{p} \\ & \text { a, is, like congregare in unum, a }\end{aligned}$ frequent phrase. Téк va roû Єeou. So called by anticipation, in order to show God's gracious designs that they should be so.
55. Zva áүyícorty éautoús] Namely, from such ceremonial defilements as they might have
contracted, previously to participation in the Paschal feast. This purification was effected by sacrifices, sprinkling of water, fasting, prayer, and other observances, which lasted from one to six days. This, and the resort of others for prayer only, brought a great concourse of people together at Jerusalem.
56. Tt סокê-غортर्णv] Point: "What think ye ? that he will not come to the feast? or, will he not come to the feast? i.e. will he, or will he not ? "E $\lambda \theta_{\eta}$ is for ḋeúveral.


 doprijs. The idiom is only found in the later
 rightly rendered by Markland, 'where Lazarus was, he who had been dead and raised to life.'
2. '̇ $\pi 0 \iota 1 \eta_{j} \sigma \alpha \nu$.] For the Impersonal 'a supper was made.' Dıทкōveı denotes attendance at table, to carve and serve the provisions. She was acting in the capacity of hostess in Simon's house.
 of ovvavaк., is found in almost all the best MSS. and the early Edds., and is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. The circumstance is mentioned, to show that since his resurrection he had possessed the usual functions of life.
 thought by some Commentators to denote that Mary had washed Jesus' feet before anointing them. But as the unguent used was liquid, the wiping would be as suitable to that as to washing. See more in the Notes on Matt. xxvi. 6-11.
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- $\boldsymbol{\eta}$ od olxia- $\mu \dot{\prime} \rho o u$ ] This is, as Midd. observes, a figurative mode of expressing the extreme fragrance of the unguent. And that Commenstator and Wets. adduce some kindred expressins from the Classical writers. See also Wakef. S. Cr. i. 156.
 denoted the box in which pipers deposited the mouth pieces of their instruments. Thence it came to denote any box or casket, for holding money, or other valuables, like the Latin marsupium. And this is the sense here and in 2 Chron. xxiv. 8. x. 11. Plat. 1060. cited by
 put therein, as contributions towards a common fund for the support of Christ and his Apostles. According to the common interpretation of the passage, the sense proceeds very awkwardly; nor
 a transposition, which the Critics call to their aid. It is plain that the sense commonly assigned to $\dot{\epsilon} \beta \dot{\sigma} \sigma r a \zeta e \nu$ cannot be tolerated; and that of managed, proposed by some, is destitute of proof, or even probability. Almost all the best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed that ¿ßér. must signify surripuit, intervertit, (like fere for auferre in Latin) of which sense the Commentators adduce examples from the later
writers, to which I would add the following very apposite one from Joseph. p. 402. 39. Huds.



 word denotes to carry off by stealth, so it might very well mean simply to steal. This sense is required by the клéx $\boldsymbol{n}$ s just before; for thus we learn why Judas took exception at the ointment being so employed, and is called thief.

7. 8. See on Matt. xxvi. 11. and Mark xiv. 7.
1. in $\dot{\text { yon }}$ on] Literally, ‘drew off,' namely, from that attachment to the teaching of the Scribes, which they had formerly had. Not, 'withdrew from the Temple service,' as some Commentators understand. For (as Campo. observes) no sect of the Jews withdrew from the synagogue. Both Jesus and his Apostles and disciples punctually attended at the Temple service, until they were expelled from the synagogues.
2. ra $\beta$ ate] This is by many Commentators said to be a Coptic word, signifying a branch of a palm-tree. But it rather comes from $\beta$ acids, slender, and thus signifies the tapering twigs of the palm-tree. Indeed the Coptic may be derived from this, just as there are numerous words in the Rabbinical writers derived from the Greek
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and Latin. Indeed the Coptic language is filled with words of foreign origin and late introduction.
3. ̈̈tı] Many MSS., Yersions, and early Fdd. have öre, which is edited by Matth., who remarks that $\ddot{\partial} \tau \iota$ was introduced into the text by Beza. Be it so-but it is supported by perhaps stronger manuscript authority than öre ; and if the external evidence be equal, the internal is quite in favour of ört; for thus $\dot{\text { épéves, }}$ not éфwiviocv, would be required. Moreover, the context requires this sense. By $\delta \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \varepsilon \tau^{\circ}$ aúroù must be meant, as most Commentators understand, ' which had been with him,' namely, on the occasion in question. 'Eфळ́vnoєע, 'had called forth.'
4. $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime \prime}$ voval] This, for $\eta^{\prime} \kappa o v \sigma \epsilon$, is found in most of the best MSS.; and early Edd., and is received by almost all Editors from Wets. to scholz. There is a transposition of roũ̃o.
5. $\theta$ ecupeite-oùdév; ;] The best Commentators antient and modern are agreed that these words must be taken interrogatively. And thus they have certainly more spirit. The words o $\kappa \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \circ \mathrm{s}-\dot{\alpha} \pi \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta_{\text {ev }}$ seem to be a popular form of speaking, denoting that a teacher has very numerous followers. The hyperbole in có $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ os is frequent in the N.T. and the Rabbinical writers.
6. "E $E \lambda \lambda \eta \nu$ es ] It is a much debated question who are here to be nnderstood. Some suppose Jews living out of Palestine, and speaking the (ireek language. And certainly there were Jews dispersed over Egypt, Asia Minor, \&cc., where Greek was the vernacular tongue, and spoken by the sojourning Jews. But that is no reason why they should be called Greeks; nor can it be proved from any passage of the N.T. that they were so called. It is therefore better to suppose (with others) that by"EגAnves are to be understood Gentiles $;$ for 1 . wherever in the N.T. 'Ioviaion and "Eג入䚇s are mentioned, by the latter are meant Gentiles; 2 . because the thing recorded is agreeable to the custom of those times; since the Gentiles worshipped not only the Gods of their own country, but of any foreign nation into which they might come; nay they made journies for the purpose of worship, to the
most celebrated foreign temples, especially that of Jerusalem. See the passages of Joseph., Philo, and Sueton., adduced (from Lightr., Wets., and Schoettg.) in Recens. Synop. Nay, many Gentiles were in that age diligent in their search after true religion, and in order thereto, frequented the Jewish synagogues, though they made no external profession of the Jewish religion, nor were circumcised. Such are in Acts
 though aeßómevoi is not here added, yet it might be understood, and these may be regarded as a sort of Proselytes. But as it cannot be proved that the Gentiles ever attended at Jerusalem at the celebration of the Passover, these may with most probability be supposed Proselytes of the gate, who, however, afterwands made profession of the Mosaic Religion.
7. lठeiv] i.e. to have an interview with. An idiom common to most languages. There were many reasons why such persons should dexire an introduction to so celebrated a person. Their motives, however, in seeking it are only to be conjectured. And the effect of the application, not being recorded, is also a matter of uncertainty. But it is most probable that they were admitted.
 occasion from this circumstance to presignify to the two disciples the future progress of the Gospel, when it should be manifested not merely to a few religiously inclined foreigners, but to all the nations of the earth in their own countries. At least, such is the view taken by Noesselt, Kuin., and others, whom see in Recens. Synop. But, notwithstanding that it seems confirmed by the context, I am inclined to think, with Lampe and Tittm., that the glory of Christ here mentioned rather consisted in the resurrection from death, ascension to heaven, and sitting at the right hand of the Father, nay even in the death itself which he suffered for the salvation of the human race, of his own free will, and from the abundant love which he bore towards the Father and towards men. This glory, they add, would be eminently displayed, when it became generally known on carth that he died to save men,-
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had, moreover, returned from death to life, had ascended to heaven, and was constituted head of the human race, Lord of heaven and earth; and finally, when he should be acknowledged by Jews and Gentiles as the supreme Saviour of all men.
 illustration of the words of the preceding verse; though the comparison is unaccompanied with application. The sense is : As a grain of corn cast into the earth, unless it die, i. e. purify, remains alone, has no increase; so it must be with me; for as it must die to yield increase, so must I undergo temporal death, in order to be glorified, and produce a great spiritual increase.' Móvos $\mu$ évé, ' remains unfruitful.' See more in Lampe and Titty. ap. Recens. Synop.
 on Matt. x. 39. Our Lord here teaches, that those of his disciples who desire communion in his glory, must not decline participation in his trials and tribulations. He who so loveth his life as to prefer to the loss of it the loss of the advantages of my kingdom, he shall not enjoy the felicity destined for those faithful followers who encounter all perils and dangers for mine and the Gospel's sake. \$ı入єiv tiv $\psi u x{ }^{j} \nu$ is for $\phi \iota \lambda o \psi v \chi \in i v$. The words have immediate reference only to the then state of things and the first Christians; but may, by accommodation, be applied to all times, and Christians of every age.
8. y $v \nu$ ท̣ं $\psi u \times \eta^{\prime}$, Sic.] If the common punctuacion and interpretation be adopted, we must suppose that, through perturbation, our Lord first utters, and then retracts a prayer. That:, however, is objectionable; and the text does not compel us to this; for many of the best antient and modern Commentators and Editors place a mark of interrogation after $\tau$ aú rs, thus making tue interrogations, as follows: What shall I say ? [Shall I say] Father, deliver me from this hour? But for this cause came I for this hour, i.e. to meet this hour. It is well observed by Camps., that "it suited the distress of our Lord's soul to suggest at first a petition for deliverance. But in this he is instantly checked by the reflection on the end of his coming. 'This determines him to cry out, Father, glorify thy name! which was not put as a queston, it is what his mind finally and fully acquiesced in. After a short, but severe, struggle,
the natural emotions of fear soon subside into acquiescence in the will of his Father, whose glory he desires may be promoted by his death."
" $\mathbf{Q}_{p a}$ to denote a time of distress, occurs also on the same subject, in Mark xiv. 35.
9. $\dagger \lambda \lambda$ en oüv $\phi$ con vi d. T. o.] Many recent Commentators understand by $\phi$ won here and at Matt. iii. 3 \& 17. simply thunder. They maintain that no words were uttered at all; and that the Evangelist did not suppose that there were any; but that he only meant to use the words which God, if he had expressed His will and intention by human voice, would have used. But see the Note on the passage of Matthew. This is rightly accounted by Tittm. an unjustifiable license of interpretation. He observes that it is inconsistent with the words of
 $\delta_{i}$ ' $\dot{v} \mu \overline{\mathrm{a}}$. . "That a voice was (says he) heard in clear and plain words, from heaven, we are not permitted to doubt, because of the exactly similar circumstances which took place, not only in the case of Moses and the children of Israel, (Exod. xix. 19.) as also in that of Samuel (see I Sam. iii. 5 . seqq.) but likewise in that of our Lord himself at his baptism, and in his transfiguration on Mount Itabyrius, which places the thing beyond dispute. For 1. the words themselves, which were heard, are expressly mentoned. 2. In the following passage not only are some said to have thought that an angel spoke with Jesus, but our Lord himself says
 So also St. Peter relates, that he and the rest who were with our Lord on Mount Itabyrius, heard a voice from heaven which said, This is my beloved Son. It is true that the by-standers differed in opinion. Some, who perhaps had not been very attentive, and had themselves not heard the words distinctly, said it thundered; for the voice had proceeded from the clouds. Others, however, had heard them, and immediately supposed that God had spoken by an angel, conformably to the opinion of the Jews, who thought that God never spoke except by the ministry of angels; and therefore they did not doubt whether the words were uttered, but in what manner." The justice of the above remarks few will deny. May not, however, (as many eminent and most orthodox Commentators think) the thunder have accompanied the voice?
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Of this many instances occur in Scripture. See Exod, xix. 16 \& 19. Rev. iv. 5. vi. 1. x. 3.
10. עüv крícts- $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}(\omega)$ There has been much difference of sentiment on the interpretation of these words, which admit of more than one sense. Tittm., after an elaborate discuesion of the sense, is of opinion that by $\alpha \rho \times \cos$ coiv кó $\sigma \mu o v$ is denoted the genius seculi, a spirit of unbelief and wickedness, (see Eph. ii. 2. and compare Acts xxvi. 18. with Col. i. 13.) and
 stand generally the influence which unbelief and iniquity exerted over the minds of men, impeding the progress of true religion and happiness. This interpretation, however, is more ingenious than solid; and I see no reason to abandon the common one, by which $\delta$ apxon is taken to mean Satan. But the Translators and Commentators who adopt this sense labour (I conceive) under some mistake. The whole should, I think, be rendered thus: 'Now is [at hand] the judgment or condemnation of the world' (i.e. now will sentence be passed on this world " which lieth in sin"); 'now will the Prince of this world be deposed from his rule. This sense of $\varepsilon_{\kappa} \beta \alpha^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda e c \nu$ is found in the best writers, who use both $\epsilon_{\kappa} \beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \in \omega \quad \beta a \sigma i \lambda e ́ a ~ d \kappa$ Tiss $\alpha \rho \chi \bar{\eta} s$ and simply $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \in \omega$. The not seeing the ratio metaphore has led the Commentators astray. The meaning is, that now is the Prince of this world about to be deposed, and his subjects condemned for sin and unbelief. That the two clauses are very closely connected in sense, is certain from a kindred passage at xvi. 11. compared with v. 6. ; where our Lord says that the Paraclete, at his coming,

 кéкрıтаь, is to be condemned, and consequently deposed. See the Note there. Thus it appears that кoigts must not here be taken (with some recent Commentators) in the sense discrimination; though that may seem countenanced by ix. 39. (see Note), for there the context is very different, and the sense of toû кó $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$ differs widely from that of roù кóouov toútov, the latter being always taken in a bad sense ; not so the former.

Finally, by the Ruler of the world being deposed is meant, that his authority is to be abofished, and his empire over the minds of men destroyed, namely, by the abolition of idolatry and superstition, and the introduction of true and vital religion.

ceive, points out, though obscurely, the meass by which the great consummation just adverted to would be accomplished, namely, by his crucifixion, resurrection, ascension, exaltation to glory, and the commencement of his office as Advocate with the Father, the first work of which would be the sending of the Holy Spirit, and then the mission of those who in every age shoald preach the Gospel. By these, and by his revealed Word in the N. T., our Lord means to say, he would draw all men to him; would offer such moral inducements and spiritual aids as would be sufficient to sway the intellect to aseent to the truths of his Religion, and the will to obey its moral requisitions. By the rairras may very well be denoted the universality intended in the blessings of redemption; though it may (as Titm. thinks) primarily mean, that these benefits shall be extended to men of every nation, both Jews and Gentiles. Moos ¿paurby suggests the place whither he is going, Hearem. Thus at xiv. $2 \& 3$. our Lord says he is going to prepare a place for them; and having prepared it, he will return and receive them to himself. 'Eay is here and at Joh. vi. 62. xiii. 20. xiv. 3. 1 Joh. iii. 2. and elsewhere, and sometimes in the Sept., put for örav, i. e. ör' \&̀v, by an ellipsis of $\%$ \%e.
33. $\sigma \eta \mu a[\nu \infty \nu]$ The word is often used (as here) of things future and obscurely signified, as in oracles, \&cc. So Plutarch cited by Wets.

34. тoù vónov] i.e. the Scriptures. See x. 34. Mévet els tod almiva, 'is to remain on earth for ever.' There are numerous passages of the Prophets referred to by the Commentators, denoting that Christ's kingdom would be everlasting. But by that was meant his Spiritual kingdom.
 hence that the terms Xpiotds and o vios rou d $\nu \theta$ рю́rov were regarded as synonymous. The speakers take for granted that Jesus is the Messiah, as he claims to be. The Commentators, however, are wrong in supposing that by ivfer$\theta$ j̄vas they understood him to speak of crucifirion. It should seem that not even the Apostles comprehended the import of what was only meant as a dark prediction to be understood after the event, for the confirmation of their faith. The multitude, as appears from what follows, under-
 of removal from earth to heaven, whether by death, or otherwise, as in the case of Flijah. Indeed, from the Rabbinical citations of Schoetts.





 $\dot{a} \boldsymbol{\pi}^{\prime}$ aíT $\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$.












we find that to be lifted from the world meant, in the Jewish phraseology, to die.

- is doriou-drfósirou] This is wrongly rendered by our English Translators ' Who is that Son of man.' 'Sis is for moos, (like quis for qualis in Latin), as in Mark i. 27. \& vi. 2. Lu. i. 66 . Job. vii. 36. and often. Render: - What sort of Son of Man is that to be?' To this question our Lord only replies indirectly, hinting at their erroneous opinions concerning the Messiah by adverting to that opportunity for obtaining light to dissipate the clouds of error, which they must use while they have it, lest they be overtaken by that spiritual darkness which will disable them from directing their course. Kaтa入a $\beta$ deject is often used of the coming on of night. At meptraтeíre sub. iv Tب. aril, which is explained at V. 36. by . $x$ tarivers ald $\tau \mathrm{d}$, $\phi$ wis, believe in Him who is the great Teacher.' By vol toū ффaròs are meant those who should follow the instructions and example of that Teacher. See Lu. xvi. 8. 'o тeคктaтaiv dy-imdरetv must be viewed in the same light as the passage at xi. 10 . where see Note, oik oì̀e moù iuráyect being a popular expression, signifying, 'he knows not how to direct his course.'
 from them and kept himself in seclusion, no longer teaching in public.' And thus (as Titer. remarks) with these words he closed the office of teaching.
37-50.] This portion is called by Grot. and Beng. the Epiphonema, or Epicrisis historic temius, containing the remarks of the Evangelist on the event (so little successful) of Christ's teaching. In this he treats 1 . of the miracles, ( v. 37-43. ) and 2. of the doctrine of Jesus; and
shows that neither could induce the Jews to believe in him.

38. 7 va] The best Commentators ancient and modern are agreed that this denotes (as often) the event, and not the cause, q.d. So that the saying of Isaiah was fulfilled. See Euthym. in Recess. Synop.

- Tindiкoñ] 'our speech,' or testimony. A sense of the word derived from the Hear. lyme. and occurring at Rom. x. 16. Gal. iii. 2. and Jerem. x. 22. B $\rho$ axiom signifies power; a common metaphor ; or rather power exerted in action. Lampe thinks this has reference to the custom of the warriors of antiquity, to uncover their arms, whether for actual battle, or for giving orders. But there can be no more than an allusion, and perhaps not that. The interrogation implies a strong negation, q.d. nemo fere, very few. And although the words might be applicable enough to the times of Isaiah, nay, to almost all times, yet (as Titty. observes) there can be no doubt but that the Prophet had in view our Lord and his age.

39. Bid тoùro] i.e. since they would not hearken to Christ's instructions. Oùk höúvauro rıatéécr. This must, of course, not be understood of absolute inability. And yet the sense must not be disposed of by silencing the word, as do Kin. and others, who regard it as redundant. We must, with the best Commentstors, ancient and modern, take it to mean, they would not, i. e. literally, they could not bring themselves to, \&e. See Titus. in Recons. Synop. and Note on Matt. xiii. 14.
40. on $\mu$ ms $\mu$ évort $]$ An accumulation of synonynous words, to strengthen the sense, an in Herodot. i. 189. On dinnovváy. yèvoutat see Note on ix. 22.
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44-50. This forms the other part of St. John's discourse above mentioned, namely, on the doctrines of Jesus, being a brief summary of them, and in our Lord's own words. See supra i. 15. and Note. The Aorists éxpaそe (which denotes public teaching) and etre must be taken as Pluperfects.

- oنхк- $\dot{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \lambda \lambda a]$ Here, as often, this denotes non tam-quam, 'not [so much] in me as [rather] in Him,' \&c. Or there may he, as Kuin. thinks, an ellip. of $\mu$ óvov, on which see my Note on Thucyd. iii. 45. and on Mark ix. 37.

45. $\dot{\delta} \theta \in \omega \rho \omega \bar{\nu}-\mu \epsilon]$ This denotes the intimate union of nature, will, counsel, \&c. between the Father and the Son. See xiv. 9. and Note. Or it may be a popular mode of expression, of which many examples are adduced by Wets. But $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ may, with Tittm., be taken of knowing.
 where see Notes. St. John often styles our Lord фw̄s.
46. où крívco au̇tóv] The words are commonly taken to mean, 'I do not here on earth act as judge over him, since I came to be a Naviour, not a Judge.' See iii. 17. v. 45. viii. 15. and Notes. Kuin. and Tittm., however, take coiveav here in the sense condemn and punish, q. d. I am not the cause of his condemnation, or that of men, having come not for the ruin, but the salvation, of men. On this verse see iii. 16-19. compared with 2 Pet. iii. 9.
47. : $\lambda$ oyos] By this and the $\tau \boldsymbol{j}$ primara are meant that part of Christ's teaching which respected his person ant offce. See iii. 17. and Note. The eimeo refers to commands; and $\lambda a \lambda{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \sigma_{0}$ to oral instruction.
48. Christ had made three declarations; 1. that he had not devised the doctrine himself, but rcceived it from the Father, and that there-
fore it did not owe its origin to human invention, but was allogether divine. 2. He testified his thorough persuasion, that those things which were committed to him to be delivered, had all no other end but the eternal salvation of men; and that his doctrine points out the way, and leads to eternal happiness. 3. He affirmed that in teaching, he had confined himself to the will of his Father; that he had neither added nor subtracted aught, and that therefore his doctrine is pure, complete, and altogether divine. (Tittm.)
XIII. Having finished the wort of public instruction, our Lord now devoted the short remainder of his life to the private instruction of his disciples. These he in Chap. xiii. xiv. $\mathbf{x v}$. apprises of his approaching trials, and endeavours to console them by kind assurances, evincing his love both to them and to the whole, human race.
49. $\pi \rho \dot{d} \boldsymbol{\tau} \hat{\mathrm{~s}} \mathrm{~s}$ dop Matt. xxvi. 2.

- flocis- $\omega \rho a]$ Of this he was well awarehad frequently conversed with his disciples upon it, and had predicted its most minute circumstances.
 self called it, signifying that he had not come on earth as a mere man, but as the Son of God, who had proceeded from and would return to the Father.
- diyaxioas toùs idious] By tois 18 . almost all Commentators understand his disciples. But
 Tittm. maintains that ihe sense must be, 'the whole human race.' That it is meant to be included, is very probable. See xvii. 24. 'Hyá$\pi \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu$. Tittm. rightly observes, that this is to be taken, like many other verbs, declaratively. By the token of love evinced by Jesus to his dis-














ciples is meant the symbolical actions mentioned just afterwards．At eis $\tau$ èioc sub．Biov；or take
 and Tittm．
2．סicirvou yev．］Many Commentators render this ．＇cena peracta．＇But，as at v． $4 \& 12$ ．， Christ is said to have risen from supper，and again sat down，others，as Tittm．，with reason take it to mean＂cena instructa，＇＂it being sup． per time．＇Such washing，indeed，was performed before，not after，a meal．Thus Titem．thinks that our Lord had sat down to table，but before， he began supper，arose，to wash his disciples＇ feet．Then having sat down again，he held the discourse here recorded．Kuin．takes $\gamma$ evopivou for örror，and thinks the sense is，＇while supper was taking．＇And he parries the objection，that washing preceded the meal，by observing，that this was an estruoordinary washing，meant as a symbolical action．Yet there were，as we find from the Rabbinical writers，turo washings at the Paschal supper．Be that as it may，the symbo－ lical action was meant to inculcate 2 lesson of humility and affectionate attention to each other＇s comfort，so much the more seasonable，as the disciples had been disputing who were to fill the chief posts in the Messiah＇s temporal kingdom．
 and other kindred phraces，with more or less variety，are used in Scripture of suggesting any thought to the mind．Many recent Commenta－ tors regard this as a popular form of expression， meant only to denote the enormity of the crime meditated．This，however，is founded on a dangerous principle，and the words evidently convey the notion of a real Being possessed of an actual power over the minds of men．The cir－ cumstances of Judas＇s temptation to betray his master，and the condeecension of that Master are mentioned together，in order to represent more strongly the baseness of Judas．
3．elbois ${ }^{\text {I }}$ Inoous－Xeipar］Tittm．has shown that the sense is：＇knowing himself to be the destined Lord of the human race and of the whole creation ；＇and that ötı dixd $\theta$ eoì $\dot{\xi} \xi \bar{i} \lambda \theta e$ ，
 can import no less than that he was of celestial origin，and dwelt in heaven before he came upon
earth．See iii．13．vi．62．xvii．5．also i．1．ii． 18. ＂Thus x $\rho \dot{d}$ т $\tau \dot{\nu}$ Өedv $\dot{u} \pi \dot{\gamma} \gamma \in i$（adds he）must mean，that the Lord would return to the Father， again to reign with Him by equal right．＂So the Classical writers speak of the Demigods as re－ turning to heaven，in similar terms，ex．gr．$\pi$ 生s

4．Ti $\theta_{\eta} \sigma_{1}$ ］lays aside．So ponere in Latin． Indeed，the Classical writers sometimes use
 is meant either the upper garment，the pallium， （plural for singular，as in corresponding Hebrew terms）or the pallium and stola．See Recens．Syn． and Note on Matth．xxiv．18．Sévtioy is a Hellenistic word，from the Latin linteum，nearly synonymous with ouvdoiv，and properly called бג́ßavoy，a tourel．To be thus girded was con－ sidered by the antients in the same light as a person＇s wearing an apron with us，namely， as indicating some servile occupation．
5．$\beta \dot{d} \lambda \lambda e t-\nu เ \pi T \bar{\eta} \rho a]$ Bád $\lambda e t$ is for $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \beta \dot{a}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda e t$, （or more properly dy $x^{e i}$ ）and occurs in this sense in Exod．xxiv．6．T T $\nu \nu / \pi$ ．Bp．Middlet． observes that the Article implies that there was but one．Such washing is seldom mentioned in the Classical writers，except the earlier ones， as Homer and Herodot．The action which，in the times of primitive simplicity，had heen done by the host or hostess to the guest，was in after ages committed to the servants，and was there－ fore accounted a servile employment．Thus it is rarely mentioned．At no tume had it been done by a superior to an inferior．
6．$\sigma v \mu 0 v \rightarrow$ דódas ；］This sort of interrogation （＇art thou going to uash my feet？＇）involves a strong negation．
7．ó évio rotā \＆cc．］A popular mode of ex－ pression for，＇The meuning of what I am doing，＇ \＆．c．Meta taùza is often used，as here，of a very short period hence．
8．dà $\mu \eta \geqslant \nu i \psi \infty \quad \sigma \epsilon$ need not be supposed （with Kuin．and others）to mean＇unless thou sufferest me to wash thee．＇This phrase is so worded，to make the thing appear 1 privilege to be conferred by Christ．＂EXe九上 $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho o s$ нeт $\alpha$ teyos is a common phrase denoting conjunction， friendship，and（from the adjunct）communion of benefits．
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9. The words of this verse exprese great earnestness, and the omission of the verb has much effect.
 tators are agreed that $\lambda \in \lambda$. denotes the washing of the whole body in a bath, as opposed to virTectat, which is used of washing part of the body. See Acts ix. 37. compared with Homer. Iliad w. 582. A guest who had gone through the former, needed only, on arrival at the house of his host, to have his feet washed, which, as the Jews wore no sandals, might be soiled by the way, or, in a hot climate, would need washing after the perspiration occasioned by walking. The offering this was a mark of civility and attention. Thus the sense is: 'He who has bathed has no need of washing himself, except his fett, but is then quite pure. Thus ye need no other washing.' " $H$ is for $\tilde{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' $\hat{n}$, which is of rare occurrence.

- кal $\dot{\nu} \mu \epsilon \overline{\mathrm{i}}$ - $-\boldsymbol{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \epsilon \mathrm{s}]$ From the nature of external and ceremonial cleansing Christ takes occasion to advert to internal and moral purity; and that by way of admonition to the disciples, and to smite the conscience of Judas. The кal may be rendered 'and [thus];' as the кal at v. 14.

12-17. Here our Lord shows the intent of the action he had been performing, admonishing them of the duty it was meant to suggest.
 ye understand the intent of what I have done to you ?'
13. 中wveité $\mu c^{\circ}$ o òst. \&c.] The Rabbinical writings show. how fond the Jewish teachers were of claiming to be thus addressed by their scholars.
14. imfic-nódas] These words are not to be taken, nor were understood, in the literal sense ; for neither the Apostles nor the primitive Christians had any such custom. As to the words
of 1 Tim. v. 10., they are to be understood of respectful and attentive hospitality. Our Lord means to inculcate the spirit which dictated this symbolical action, i.e. of humility, condescension, and kindness.
 the Heb. שלוח. A similar maxim is cited from the Rabbinical writers.
17. sl тaüra-aiutd $]$ The el may be rendered siquidem, since, as at V . 14. ©i Eivera, \&c. Acts xi. 17. xvi. 15. xviii. 15. Rom. viii. 31. and elsewhere; on which sense see Herm. on Vig. is 312 . Math, Gr. $\$ 508$. Buttm. Gr. p. 240. 2. They knew the things in question, as having been just told them by our Lord. On the sentiment it is well observed by Lampe, "Knowledge must precede holiness ; but it is not of itself sufficient. The pructice must be added. These two things are inseparably connected: knowledge is the rule of practice, and practice the scope and purpose of knowledge."
18. ó̀ $\pi \not \subset \rho l-\lambda e ́ \gamma \omega]$ Paraphrase ' Of all of you I cannot say that ye are impressed with the truth of what I have been saying, and will be happy in the practice thereof.'

- oida oüs $\left.\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \in \lambda \in \xi^{\alpha} \mu \eta \nu\right]$ ]. The sense is, 'I know the [dispositions of the] persons whom I have chosen [as Apostles].' So xy. 16. iy
 \&c. sub. тойтo rivetal, or the like. The iva has the eventual force. Render, 'But fsuch is the case with you] that the words of Scripture are fulfilled;'. what was literally meant for Ahitophel being typically intended for Judas:
 victor, a familiar friend. The communion of domestic hospitality has, in every age, been accounted an inviolable, pledge of friendship. See Eurip. Hec. 793. Quint. Curt. vii. 4. 'ETyे' pav, \&c. The sense in, 'has endeavoured to




















supplant and treacherously overthrow me.' A metaphor taken, according to some, from wrestling; but more probably, according to others, from kicking horses, oren, \&e., which suddenly and slily kick at and injure their feeders.
 you this now before it has happened, that when it has taken place, ye may be confirmed in your faith that I am He [whom I professed to be, the Messiah]. There is the same omission at viii. 24. and elsewhere; in which and many other similar cases we recognize what we should call genuine modesty in a distinguished human being ; though in speaking of our Lord, the language even of commendation should be checked by reverential awe. Mr or. is taken as at ii. 11. and elsewhere; in which intension of the sense denoted by the verb is meant. Our Lord's purpose, no doubt, was not only to confirm their faith, but calm their perturbation at the perfidy soon to be disclosed, since his words allude to only one traitor, as indeed he soon afterwards intimates in express terms.

20. So Matt. x. 40. where see Note. The connexion here is variously traced. The scope of the words seems to be, to fortify them under the tribulations they should endure in the course of their Apostolic office, by the remembrance that as they sustained the character of representatives of their Lord, they should not be troubled at having to suffer, as He had, from the treachery, cowardice, stupidity, and perverseness of those whom they taught.
 Maptupeiv denotes open and express declaratron, in contradistinction to the indirect allusion at r .20.
21. $\dot{\beta} \boldsymbol{\beta}$ emory cis $\dot{d} \lambda \lambda$.] This well depicts their
anxiety, as aжорои́мevoc their perplexity what to think or whom to suspect. See Gen. xiii. 1. and How. I1. ©. 480. Acts $x$ xv. and Gal. v. 20.
21-30.] On this portion see Notes on Matt. xxvi. 21-23. and Lu. xxii. 15. and xvi. 22. Job. i. 48. By the disciple whom Jesus loved the Evangelist, with the modesty observable elsewhere, (as $\times x .2$. xxi. 7.) means himself.
22. revet] 'hutu significavit.' See Note on Lu. i. 22.
23. dxireaciv] 'resting, leaning upon.' Euthym., however, thinks John did not alter his posture, but merely turned his head. That this question was put in a low voice, and answered in the same tone, is plain from Vr . $28 \& 29$.
24. $\psi_{o o \mu i o v] ~ T h i s ~ i s ~ i l l ~ r e n d e r e d ~ s o p ; ~ a n d ~}^{\text {a }}$ here not well translated morsel, though that signification is sometimes found. As derived from $\psi \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\omega}$, it signifies (like the Hebr. פת from to break) a bit or piece of any thing. And here probably it denotes a piece of the paschal lamb dipped in the sauce. Such portions were distributed by the master. Jesus, it seems, was thus engaged, when John putting the above question to him, he either helped Judas first, or, in serving out the portions, had come to him in his turn. Judas, then, (perhaps sitting near Jesus, and having heard John's interrogation, or, with the suspicion natural to guilt, supposing that they were speaking of him ), after receiving the portion, asks in a low voice, ls it I, master? To whom Jesus answers oi eixas, it is thou. (See Math. xxvi. 25.) Then in a loud voice he adds of motes moincoy ráxiov, ' what thou art to do do very quickly.' Here the Present movers is for the Future. The Imperative is, as Chris. remarks, permissive.
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 and Edd. are at variance as to the exact reading, and still more the position; the words being in some copies connected with what precedes, in others with what follows. The opinions of Editors and Commentators are almost equally divided. Now oiv, though it is found in most of the MSS., may have come from the margin. Yet those MSS. certainly all attest that the words were taken with the following, not the preceding words. For the Stephanic text, which adopts oüv, and yet connects the words with the preceding, cannot be tolerated. It seems certain, therefore, that the words must be connected with the following. (as I have edited), for if they be joined with the preceding, the oin must be cancelled. And then the next verse will begin with abruptness, considering the context, unprecedented. Whether oüv should be cancelled or not, is uncertain. I should be inclined to think, with almost all the Critics, that it ought, were it not probable that, in the MSS. which omit it, it was thrown out by those who, construing the words with the preceding, regarded it as worse than useless. And the fact is, that it is omitted chiefly in those MSS. which connect the clause with the preceding. At $\tilde{\eta}^{\nu} \nu \dot{\nu} \xi$ the words $\ddot{0} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \tau e d \xi \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta e$ may very well be understood; but if expressed, they make after $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta_{\epsilon}$ as offensice a repetitiom, as they leave in the following sentence a harsh omission. Matthæi, after a learned array of conflicting authorities of Fathers, edits (with that sort of grave folly occasionally observable in his Editorial deci-

25. On the departure of Judas our Lord delivered those most interesting last discourses with his disciples, by which he intended to infix in their minds truths, which, ignorant as they were, and labouring under heavy affiction, they could not, indeed, at that time, fully comprehend, but which they would afterwards understand, and by which, even now, they would be fortified against their impending trials and afflictions. (Tittm.) In E $\delta 0 \xi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta$ we have the Prophetic Preterite, used of what is shortly to happen, to express certainty. See Joh. xi. 23. xv. 6. xvi. 33. and Notes. On this glory, both as it regarded our Lord and the Father, see Wets. and Tittm. in Recens. Synop.
 to say whether $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \dot{\varepsilon}$ enutū should be referred to God, or to Christ. Rosenm. and others avoid the difficulty in their explanation; while Kuin. and others attempt to get rid of it' by supposing the words redundant!' The question is ably discussed by Lampe as follows: "If it be referred to God, God glorifies Christ in himself because
by himself, by his own divine glory, (see Rom. vi. 4.), his perfections all shining in the Sorbecause he will himself be glorified by the glonfication of the Son-because he glorifies his Son with himself, giving him a communion and equality of glory, \&c. If to the Son, he is glonified in himself, because the glory, though given by the Father, is his own, and because by the glorification, he possesses an eternal fount from which the glory of all the elect to the end of the world will be derived."
26. тeкvía] This appellation was (as Lampe observes) employed in antient times by masters to their dependants, and generally by superions to inferiors, especially by teachers to their pupils. It is expressive of affection, especially parental.

- oí dóvacoe è $\lambda$ 日eiv] i. e. not now, but, as is added further on at xiv. 3., hereafter.

34. drvo $\eta_{\eta} \nu-d \lambda \lambda \lambda \lambda$ ious $]$ There have been some causeless difficulties raised on the sense of these words, and that by pressing too much on the sense of кauviv. In removing these, some of the best Commentators (as Lampe, Kuin., and Knapp) make some rather sophistical distinctions, and especially by laying an undue stress on кa日wis. It must, 1 think, be granted that these words are not to be regarded as a general precept of mutual love, though such precepts abound in the N. T. See Eph.v.2. 1 Thess. iv. 9. James ii. 8. 1 Joh. ii. 8-11. iii. 23. It was very necessary to be then inculcated to the Apostles, as the best alleviation of the trials and tribulations they would have to undergo. Nay, the very Mosaic rule itself (Lev. xix. 18.) was not universal, but particular, and confined to their countrymen. The injunction was not absolutely new, and yet in some sense the injunction here given to the Apostles was new to them, whether we consider sentiments, opinions, or practice. In their contest for pre-eminence, and selfish preference for themselves, in their worldly proud and envious spirit, they had forgotten the precept of mutual love. Hence our Lord had before enjoined on them the opposite virtues by an affecting symbolical action; and now enforces one of the most important of these duties by the present injunction, which might, as Tittm. observes, be called new, if we consider the standard to which the duty was raised,
 the epithet. They were (as Titum. remarks) to show as sincere and unfeigned an affection to each other, as fellow labourers in the Gospel, and by no means to suffer this holy society to be torn asunder by hatred, variance, envy, strife \&c.; but rather to preserve it.by mutual concord and being united in the bonds of pure
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affection." The same able Commentator has shown, at large, how the precept, taken in 2 general sense, might be called new, as it regarded the custom of the times; that as a Christian precept, occurring elsewhere in the N.T., it was so far nerve, as being enforced by new moLives, to be performed in a new manner, and made a peculiar characteristic of the Christian Religion, as is suggested in the words dy roúte yucícoutat \&c., and which was so observed by the first Christians, that the Heathens used to say; "See how these Christians love one another!" See Acts iv. 32.
XIV. Now follow two discourses of Christ, one held at the table, the other on going out of the city. The former is contained in Ch. xiv., the latter in Ch. xv., xvi. The discourse at table consists of three parts. 1. Consolation for the impending affliction, v. 1-5. II. Exhortation to faith in Christ, v. 5-15. III. A promise of the Holy Spirit, v. 16 - fin. (Schoettg.) The whole relates to the A pestles only. (Bp. Peace.) But it was no doubt meant to apply, mutatis mutandis, to all future Teachers of the Gospel.
 sense is; 'There is no need that you should be troubled at what I have said of my departure: only trust in God and me.' Hivtéere admits of being taken either in the Indicative, or in the Imperative. The former is adopted in the Vulg. and by the earlier modern Commentators ; the latter by many antient Fathers, and almost all the modern Commentators from Whity to Titer. From the connexion of the words, it would be harsh, and, I think, unprecedented to suppose the same word used first in the Indicstire, and then in the Imperative, in the same sentence. Nothing but a necessity resulting from the impossibility of otherwise attaining 2 good sense could authorize this. But the Imperative yields a sense (as Campb. observes) not only good, but apposite ; and we may compare many similar exhortations to "trust in the Lord" found in the Psalms, and elsewhere in the O.T.
 them from temporal ambition, and console them under present affliction, by a representation of the ample felicity be is going to prepare for
them. By èv tin olxía roū aa tpós $\mu$ ow is expressed кат' du рштота日eiav Heaven. In the royal modal some fancy an allusion to the numerous chambers in the House of His Father on earth, the Temple ; and others, as Tertullian, \&c. infer from the mo $\lambda \lambda$ al that there are various degrees of reward in Heaven, proportioned to men's progress in faith and holiness. Mosheim supposes an allusion to the custom of Eastern Monarchs of assigning to their courtiers, \&c. habitations within the precincts of their vast palaces. All that seems designed by our Lord is, to console them under affliction by a view of the glory and boundless felicity in reserve for the faithful servants of God and Christ. The words imply a participation in those mansions of bliss, which our Lord was going to occupy, and to which he would lead the way to all his disciples. By modal our Lord also meant (as Titty. observes) to show that Heaven is a most ample space, which can hold an immense multitude, and is sufficient for the reception of vast numbers, nay, as far as concerns the will of the Father, all men.
 so (i. e. had there not been mansions in heaven laid up for the righteous, and ye could not follow me thither, as the Sadducees maintain) I would have told you so, and not deceived you with vain hopes.' The punctuation at $\dot{\boldsymbol{j} \mu \mathrm{i} \nu}$ is disputed. Some place a comma, but that proposed by Tala, Berra, and Grot., and adopted by almost all the later Commentators, namely, to place a period, is, probably, the true one.

- жорє́йдаt \&c.] These words contain (as Tittm. observes) a sentence of particular application in confirmation of the foregoing general one. "'Nay, 1 go to prepare a place for you there:" a similitude taken from one who goes before another to some unknown country, to prepare for his reception. This preparation was made by Christ's sacrifice on earth, and his intercession in heaven.
 mentators are agreed that the sense is, ' When I shall have gone, and shall have prepared a
 for $\pi \dot{\alpha} \lambda_{i v}$ in $\lambda$ évoo ai. The Commentators are Cc
k Supr. 12. 45. infr. ver. 211 et 17.21, 23.











not agreed whether this coming of our Lord is to be understood of the last day, (see vv. $18 \& 28$. xii. 26. Acts i. 11. 1 Thess. iv. 17.) or of the day of each man's death. The former interpretation is supported by most antient and earlier moderns; the latter by the generality of the recent Commentators. The words are, indeed, a continuation of the foregoing similitude, and derived from the custom of persons who have gone forward to prepare a residence for their friends, returning to fetch and accompany them thither. But if the latter interpretation be adopted, it would seem a mere accommoration, with little meaning. And even were we to grant, what yet has never been proved, that at death the righteous are immediately received up into heaven, yet the maintainers of that doctrine do not assert that Christ comes to fetch them. The common interpretation, then, is on all accounts preferable, and it is placed beyond doubt by the following passage of 1 Thess. iv. 16., where the language of the Apostle is quite a commentary on that of his






 $\dot{d} \sigma \rho_{\mu c \theta a}$. The purpose of both passages is the same, namely, the comforting of the persons addressed.

4. Triv $\dot{j} \delta \delta \nu$ ] i.e. the means whereby ye may arrive thither, namely, by faith in Christ. As, however, the disciples did not thoroughly comprehend our Lord's meaning, (confounding the terms with notions of an earthly kingdom, and never of the death of the Messiah), our Lord makes his meaning yet clearer at v. 6.; but employs a certain boldness of metaphor, in order to impress it in a more lively manner.
 or $\dot{\delta} \delta \eta \chi^{\dot{\delta}}$, a guide. The other terms, मे $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta e i a$ and $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \xi \boldsymbol{j}$, are by the best Commentators supposed to be put; by Hebraism, for the adjectives
 v.9. \& xi. 25. But, in fact, there is a more energetic mode of expression, q.d. I am the way, the true way [to life], the author of life and happiness; the third term being exegetical of the two former. The words following are exegetical of the preceding clause, and by the coming of the Futher is denoted introduction to the heavenly
mansions just before mentioned, alone to be obtained by means of the one true guide to life and happiness, and through his propitiation.
 ing Christ is denoted the knowledge of his attributes, his infinite wisdom, benevolence, mercy, \&c., which, if they be fully known, will be found the same as those of the Father. This implies that mysterious union of the Father and the Son which makes the will of the latter espentially the will of the former.

- кal $\dot{d} \boldsymbol{\pi}^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau$-aúróv] There is here, as Kuin. observes, a climax; doāv denoting a deeper insight into any thing than rusioxem. Thus the sense may be : Henceforth, i.e. after my departure, ye will have known and sear him.' 'The best Commentators are agreed that the I'resent is here (as often) used of what is very shortly to be, and that in order to suggest its speedy occurrence. We may therefore render: 'Ye will very soon know, and, as it were. have seen Him,' i. e. after his death, and at the sending of the Holy Spirit to guide them into all truth.
 founded on Philip's erroneously taking " ses" in the literal sense. 'Apkei $\dot{\psi \mu i y, ~ ' t h a t ~ w i l l ~}$ amply satisfy us.'

9. oúk éfvcokás $\mu \varepsilon$ ] 'have known my true character.'

- $\dot{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \omega \alpha \times c \dot{s}-\pi a r e ́ \rho a]$ 'He who hath seen me hath [in effect] seen the Father, namely, by my works.' The Apostles had seen the sanctity of his life, his contempt of earthly riches and honours, his submission to the lowest state of poverty and misery, his sole desire after the salvation of souls. They had, moreover, seen his majesty, " the majesty of the only begoten of the Father," (see i. 14.) nay, were shortly to see him die for the human race. But in all this they had, in fact, heard and seen the Father, i.e. the image, decrees, counsels, and works of the Father respecting the salvation of men. He who saw Jesus living, acting, and dying, saw, in fact, the Father, i. e. the image of the Father, and the effigies of the divine nature. There was, therefore, no need that our Lord should then show them the Father, and more fully expound his counsels and decrees. They might ulready have sufficiently known them from the words and actions of their Lord, and would shortly know and comprehend them more fully by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. (Tittm.)










 $\dot{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\omega}$ тоィท' $\boldsymbol{\omega}$.


 phrase eivat è $\tau \iota v$ imports intimate conneriom and conjunction reith, the nature of which must vary with the subject and the context. Tittm. shows that here (as also at x . 38 .) community of work and pouer is meant, including also parity of feelings and counsels.
- $\tau \alpha \dot{\rho} \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau \alpha$-ò $\lambda a \lambda \omega \bar{\omega}$ ] These words, and
 illustration of the community just mentioned, as applied both to words and to works. In the latter clause all will be regular, if we supply, as corresponding to the $\tau \alpha \dot{\rho} \dot{j} \mu \alpha \tau a-\lambda a \lambda \bar{\omega}$, the
 motw. There is a plain reference to this omitted clause in the introductory óe. Here Tittra. ably draws the following inference: "But since a conjunction not only in respect of counsel und uill, but in respect to one and the same energy and power, subsists between the Father and the Son, it may be hence, with certainty, inferred that there is also between them a communion of one and the same nature; and when our Lord affirms, that "the Father abideth in him," he has indicated a perpetuity of mutual conjunction, and testifies that it is impossible he should ever do any thing contrary to the mind, counsel, and wishes of the Father.

11. miotcíere \&c.] Here Christ not only repeats the foregoing assertion, but admonishes them to repose faith in it; telling them (as a popular proof of His conjunction with the Father) that His works (i.e. miracles) argue community of mind, energy, and power.
 this promise, given for their encouragement, appertained solely to the Aportles. By the ta
 part of Christ's work which he at xvii. 4. calls the coork committed to him by the Father, namely, in promulgating the Father's plan of salvation through the Son, in confirming it by miracles in collecting a community of those who should embrace the plan of salyation, \&c. \&c. By the greater works here mentioned we are to understand not greater per se; for as far as regards the miracles worked by the Apostles, none were more illustrimes than those performed by our

Lord, (who, indeed, worked very many not recorded by the Evangelists, see Joh. $\times x .30$.) but only in a certain degrec, partly in reepect to their office and ministry, (which is alone the subject of these words) and partly in respect to the effects of that ministry. See more in Tittm. and Whitby.
 is an obscurity, which has led to diversity of interpretation. Some eminent Commentators seek to remove the difficulty by closely connecting the words with those of the next verse. But that is doing violence to the construction without eliciting any very good sense. The obscurity has, I conceive, arisen from extreme brevity; and the misconception of the sense been partly occasioned by not noticing an emphasis in ${ }^{\circ} \gamma \cos ^{\prime}$; and still more by not observing the omission of some words left to be supplied. The sense is, 'For $I$ [as for my part] am going to my Father, [and must leave the works I have been doing to be done by others].'
13. $\delta \tau_{t} \hat{\alpha} \nu$ alc.] i.e. whatsoever in the furtherance of the work committed to you. Compare this verse with xv. 16. xvi. 23., whence it follows (as Whitby shows) that as both Father and Son equally hear and grant the petitions offered up in the name of Christ, both equally possess omniscience and omnipotence. 'Ev r甲 $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{\boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\prime} \mu, ~ s i g n i f i e s ~ ' i n ~ m y ~ c a u s e, ' ~ ' f o r ~ t h e ~ f u r t h e r-~}^{\text {' }}$ ance of my cause,' as is shown at large by Tittm. ' $E \nu \tau \bar{\omega}$ vi $\bar{\varphi}$, i. e. by and through the Son.
 further encouragement, Christ adds a promisa, on the nature of which there has been much difference of opinion. Most of the earlier Commentators assign to mapdi. the sense of comforter ; others, teacher ; others, again, helper : and not a few, advocate, or intercessor. These interpretations are each of them copiously discussed in Recens. Synop. On examination it will, I apprehend, appear, that those of comforter, teacher. and some others which have been proposed, are too limited to reach the extent of signification evidently meant by the term, or that of the gifts imparted by the Holy Spirit. One of the two senses, Helper and Intercessor, is, no doubt, the true one; the former of which is adopted by













almost all recent Commentators; the latter by Bp. Pearson, Lampe, Ernesti, Pearce, Wets., and others. And this (especially as it is confirmed by most of the antient Fathers and Commentators) seems to be preferable, and it has the peculiar advantage of including the former, since, as appears from the passages of the Classical writers adduced by Lampe, Wets., and Tittm., ta $\alpha \alpha^{\prime} \kappa \lambda \eta \tau 0 \varepsilon$ is used not only of a person called in to plead one's cause, but of one who is a helper in any matter, or generally a patron. And as both these offices are centered in the Paraclete (and may be said to include that of Teacher and Comforter) there can be no doubt that both are intended.
16. els т $\dot{\nu} \nu a i \bar{\omega} \nu \alpha]$ The best Commentators are agreed, that the context here limits the sense, so as to be synonymous with els re入os, 'to the end of life.'
 Commentators explain, the author of all truth, the very truth itself (and the importer of it), Gospel truth. There is, however, a reference to the Holy Spirit as being this Paraclete. See v. 17 \& 26 . From this passage, compared with the following one and xv.26. xvi. 13. Matt. $x$. 20. Acts ii. $18 \& 33$. Rom. viii. 9. Gal. iv. 6. Phil. i. 19. 1 Pet. i. 11., the Persmality and Divinity of the Holy Ghost is manifest, as well as His procession from the Father and the Son. Bee the excellent Notes of Lampe and Tittm. in Rec. Syn.

- $\dot{o} \kappa \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ ] i.e. the sensual, corrupt, and worldly-minded part of it. Oi dóvaтat גaßeì. i.e. in a manner, cannot receive it, since, from exclusive attention to worldly things, they neither understand, nor care about, spiritual gifts. And thus it happened, as is just afterwards said, that they have neither any perception nor any knowledge of the thing. Méves, 'is [soon] to abide.'

18. oúk dфríw úpis do ф. \&cc.] These words are variously interpreted. Some refer them solely to Christ's reappearance, and society with them, after his resurrection. Others take them in a figurative sense of Christ's invisible and spiritual presence. But it is best, with Titty. and Kain., to unite both interpretations. And this is supported by facts. For (as Tittm. ob-
serves) Christ did return literally to his ciples, after his resurrection, in a visible $\pi i$ nev; and metaphorically, unseen, after he: cension to heaven; when also, as he progir in departing to heaven (see Matt. xxvii. y he was perpetually present with them br gracious aid of his omnipotent power in this charge of their Evangelical functions. He always with them, and, in fact, gave them. " absent, greater aid than he had done when; sent. 'Opфavos is properly an adjective. may here be rendered destitute. It is u* those who are deprived of the aid and aft of relations or friends.
19. kail] 'and [then].' Өecopei, 'is towill see.' Өєwpeite, 'ye will see me.' 2
 words may be taken, in a metaphorical series the spiritual life. Nay, both the physics' metaphorical senses may have been intend
20. $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad \epsilon \kappa . ~ T \bar{\eta} \dot{\eta} \mu$. ] i. e. when the prot: the sending of the Paraclete shall be fut ${ }^{\prime} E \gamma^{\omega}{ }^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \bar{\sim} \boldsymbol{\tau} \pi \alpha \tau \rho l$, \&c. On this indistri. union see v.7. and Note.
21. $\dot{\delta}$ et $X \infty \nu-\alpha \gamma a \pi \bar{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon]$ This is a rept of the sentiment at v .15 . See also vv .23 a xv. 14. 1 Joh. ii. 5. iii. 18-24. "EXecs here. often elsewhere, denotes to have in mind, ${ }^{h_{*}}$ quainted with. To the passages adduced ts Commentators may be added Isocr. Nip;



- $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \phi$ avow aùrep $\dot{d} \mu$.] This is by sonic derstood literally, of Christ's personal ap ante after his resurrection. But that intr: ration (as Kin. observes) is at variance: the explanation of the words at $\mathbf{v} .23$. It $: 1$ be taken, with others, metaphorically, of an visible and spiritual manifestation. Thous far as regards the disciples, both may be il joined, as at v. 18.

22. Ḱ́ptє-кóб $\mu \boldsymbol{\text { ] }}$ ] This question, which. Lampe observes, displays "ignorance proc" ing from prejudice and conjoined with alar originated in misapprehension of our $L$ words, arising from the false notions they en: trained of the Messiah's kingdom. "To thisLord (observes Tittm.) answered not direct (because they would not have comprehend












him) but merely assigns a reason for the distinccion he would make between his disciples and the world, or turns their attention to what it especially behoved them to know and believe, mamely, that not He only, but the Father would be perpetually with them by His grace and Holy Spirit, and that then they would understand all things necessary for them to know."

Before ti yeqovev I have inserted kal, from many of the best MSS., some Versions and Fathers, and the Ed. Princ. It has been received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. There is a kindred construction at ix. 36. кal tis èart, Kúple, \&c., where many inferior MSS. (with the received Text) omit the кal. Add 2 Cor. ii. 2. kal tis éatı, \&ec. This forms one branch of that generic construction, by which кal is used with particles of interrogation; when it has always an intensive force.
 mentators adduce examples of the phrase $\mu о \nu \eta \nu$ moieiv, which they regard as synonymous with $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ évety. But it is, in fact, a more significant expression, and denotes a continued abiding. Of course, it is to be taken in a metaphorical sense, and (as Kuin. observes) is meant to illustrate
 proper, however, with Kuin., to regard $\pi \rho d s$ aùd $\dot{d} \dot{\dot{e}} \lambda$. as only serving for ornament ; since in the $\mathbf{O}$. T. God is said to come to men, when he promises or bestows peculiar benefits on them ; also to duvell or remain with those whom he especially favours; as also to leave and depart from those whom he ceases to benefit. This is strongly supported and confirmed by those passages of Plato and Philo cited in Recens. Synop.

Besides, God and Christ may be said to come by the Holy Spirit, whose temple (to use the words of Whitby) is the body of the Saints, ( 1 Cor. iii. 16. vi. 13.) and by whose indwelling they are made an habitation of God. Eph.ii. 22 . By this Spirit the Father and Son dwell in all true Christians.
 ceive, a resuming of what Christ was going to say when he was interrupted by Judas's question. It is meant to affirm the same truth negatively, and consequently there is implied the
 will not have the love of myself and the Father,
the revealing and the other benefits resulting from thence. In the words following there must again (as I observed in Recens. Synop.) be supplied something to complete the sense, which is rather hinted at than fully expressed, namely, ' he therefore who rejects me, rejects the Father.' O $\dot{\omega}$-- $\dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ may here (as often) signify non tam-quan, implying no more than community of participation in commanding.
 "These instructions and consolations have I given you while present with you. At my departure the Holy Spirit will be your Teacher and Helper."
 in my place. Mávra, i.e. all things important for you to know, respecting the counsels of God and the work of Christ for the salvation of men. raouviंधet, i. e. will bring to mind whatever having been said had been forgotten, or imperfectly understood and misconceived. Thus the two clauses import the communication of, or bringing to mind all necessary knowledge, and a rectification of all misconception.
27. eip $\eta \nu \eta \nu \dot{\alpha} \phi i \eta \mu \iota-\dot{i} \mu i \nu]$ This is not, I conceive, (as many learned Commentators suppose) a mere form of farevell, but a solemn and affecting valediction and benediction, as of a man about to leave his friends for ever. Tij $\langle\mu \eta \nu$ cip. seems added in further explanation and confirmation of the clpriv $\nu$ just before. 'Aфinus is employed suitably to the imagery, and alludes to 2 dying man as bequeathing. The d $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu$ taken in reference to the subsequent clause, is emphatical, and suggests that this peace is given by Christ alone. The words of that clause are exegetical of the preceding, and suggest a comparison not between the mode of giving (for ca0cos has often a very lax sense) but between the kind of gifts; the world (as Gerhard observes) conferring external, empty, and transitory peace; Christ bestowing internal and spiritual, firm, stable, and solid peace. Of the superiority of internal peace to al external advantages the antient Philosophers copiously dilate, as appears from the citations in Recens. Synop.
28. Our Lord concludes by the same exhortation as that with which he had commenced this sublime address; after which, adverting to what he had said of his departure from them, he urges that their love of Him should make them rather
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rejoice than grieve thereat. To use the words of Tittm. " our Lord also tells them that he is going, not any where, not to some distant region of the world (as some of the disciples fancied, xiii.36.) but to the Father, to resume the majesty and glory he had before the creation of the world; and that from him he would send to his disciples his Holy Spirit, and be their present and omanipotent aider and helper."
 these words (which have staggered many orthodox Commentators, and have been abused by the Unitarians to impugn the doctrine of Christ's divinity) see the invaluable annotatory matter introduced from Lampe, Zanchius, and Tittm. in Rec. Syn. in which it is shown in what respects, and in what sense, Christ might be said to be inferior to the Father. But the matter, on so awful a subject, admits not of abridgment, and its length permits it not to be here introduced. Suffice it to remark, that the very mention of the comparison implies the fallacy of supposing Christ to have been a mere man.
29. єірŋка] sail. тойто, i.e. 'his departure and the sending to them of the Paraclete.' Hor. must, as before, be taken of confirmation in faith.
30. oùk ét८ т. $\lambda_{a x \lambda}$.] As this is suspended on the " $\rho \chi \in \tau a t$ $\gamma \alpha \rho \& c$., it is plain that the sense requires not will, but shall, i. e. I shall not have opportunity to discourse much with you. On
 31. The words eq $\epsilon \mu$ gl out $\chi$ ex Xe oúdèv are by the best Commentators admitted to mean 'hath no power,' ' will have no effect against me,' viz. in frustrating the plan of salvation. 'Ep $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \mathrm{ol}$ may literally be rendered ' in respect of me.' These words were made good by the event. See Acts ii. 23.

Toútov after кóбцov is omitted in very many of the best MSS., Versions, and earlier Fathers, and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz, being supposed to have been introduced from xii. 3. But it is perhaps more likely to have been omitted by accident, especially as the idiom (on which I have treated at xii. 3) almost demands the Article. And yet that is too minute a propriety to have been known to the scribes, or even some antient Critics.
31. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda$ ' 'iva $\gamma \nu \bar{\varphi}$ Sic.] Here (as often before iva and such particles) something is left to be understood, and may be variously supplied. Render, " the purpose of all that shall happen is
to evince my obedience to the Father." This sense of $\alpha \gamma a \pi \omega^{\circ}$ is required by the words $\kappa \alpha \theta_{\text {ais }}$

XV. Commentators are not agreed as to the place where the remaining portion (Ch. xv., xvi., xvii.) of Christ's discourse was delivered. Many think it was pronounced somewhere on the way from Jerusalem to Gethsemane. But of this there is no proof, and, from the nature of the discourse, little probability. Nay, the words of
 plainly shew that the words cannot have been delivered, as some imagine, at Gethsemane, nor on the road thereto ; but (as Glass, Pearce, Lampe, Doddr., Kin., Knapp, and Tittm. maintain) in the guest chamber, after having risen from table, and previous to the departure. In this resumption of the foregoing discourse our Lord, loath to part with his faithful followers, enlarges on, and further illustrates the same topics.

1. ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \omega^{\dot{\prime}} \epsilon l \mu \iota \dot{\eta}{ }^{\boldsymbol{\alpha}} \mu \mu \pi$. $\boldsymbol{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$.] This similitude (probably suggested by the wine on the table) was a not uncommon one. It is often used in the O.'T., of the Jewish people and Church, and, as appears from the Rabbinical writers, was sometimes taken to designate the Messiah. Our Lord, it may be observed, means here the trunk of the vine. On the exact sense of $\dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta$. Commentaters are not agreed. It is best explained by
 cia] каржофоройба. The force of the Article here is the same as in $\dot{o}$ roo priv $\dot{o}$ кalds, $x .14$. where see Note. In calling God the reap $\gamma \dot{\text { o }}$ (i.e. $d \mu \pi \epsilon \lambda o v \rho \gamma \delta s$, genus for species) Christ follows the usage of the O.T. See Is.v.l-7. Jer. ii. 21. Ps. lex. 8-11.
2. es ' $\mu \mu \mathrm{ol}$ ] 'belonging to me,' i. e. considered as the trunk. Sub. of for 'ot dots, like фépov for \$' фépft. By the branches are meant Christian professors. Alpert, 'cuts it away.' Opposed to which, by paronomasia, is кaधalpet, which means purgat, i.e. by ridding it of those useless shoots which most abound in the best trees. "Thus (says Lampe) the purity of the soul is promoted. when the heart is circumcised, when the body of sin is more and more destroyed (Rom, vi. 6.), when ignorance is removed, errors corrected, and vice eradicated, and when the excessive luxuriance, either from irregular desires, external prosperity, or mental inflation, is checked." On the difference between the works of mere nature and those produced under the Gospel, see Recent.



















Synop. and an apposite passage, which I have there adduced from Plutarch. By rieiova кafx $\boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ is meant not only more fruit, but, by implication, better. See Lampe.
3. $\left.\eta_{0} \boldsymbol{\eta}-\dot{\boldsymbol{u}} \mu \mathrm{i} \nu\right]$ From V. 3-17. Christ gives the application of the comparison, showing to what kind of vine branches they were to be referred, and the duties suitable to that state. (Lampe.) By ка日a pos is here meant freed from ignorance, error, and prejudice, and therefore capable of bearing spiritual fruit. They were then, in a great measure, purified; though they were soon afterwards to be made quite so by the efficacy of the Holy Spirit soon to be manifested. Hence in the next v. Christ exhorts them not to break the mutual conjunction between them and himself, but constantly cultivate it, as He should on his part preserve it for ever.
 ceding peivare. Thus the cal is for cal ojitw, (as in vi. 56. and 1 Job. iv. 15.) so also.

- ка $\theta \omega \dot{\omega} \tau \delta \kappa \lambda \bar{\eta} \mu a-\mu \epsilon i \nu \eta \tau \epsilon]$ Here is another argument to union, deduced rom the highly beneficial effects of it. The similitude is nearly akin to the former. As the branches receive all their life and efficacy from the trunk, so must they adhere to Christ and his injunctions, if they would produce spiritual fruit. 'A $\phi$ ' ea $\alpha v \tau 0 \bar{u}, ~ ' b y ~$ its own virtue.
 Oi dúv. noceìv oudèv, i.e. cannot bear much fruit.

6. $\left.\frac{1}{\beta} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \theta_{\eta} \tilde{\varepsilon} \xi_{\infty}\right\rceil$ The best Commentators are agreed that the Aorist is here for the Future, or rather the Present, as being used of what is caustomary. Td $\kappa \lambda \bar{\eta} \mu a$, i.e. the branch which has been separated from the trunk. The cal before i $\xi_{\eta} \dot{\alpha}^{\prime} \nu \theta_{\eta}$ is not put (as some imagine) for the relative, but auto is understood. At auyaryougt sub. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho$ рөтol. The aura is used for aúrd, po. pulariter.

Before $\boldsymbol{\pi} \bar{u} \rho$ many MSS. and some early Ld. add the Article, which is admitted by Math., Griesb., Knapp., Titty., Vat., and Scholz ; but without sufficient reason; for the same phrase occurs without the Article at Matt. iii. 10. vii. 19. Lu.iii.9. There are also many other passages where the Article is not found whenever $\pi \bar{u} \rho$ is used of fire generally, as here. But when it is used of any particular one, (as the fire of Hell) the Article is used, especially when applied to the fire in any house, the reason for which is, that there was generally but one such.
 another argument for the preservation of this communion, in stating which the foregoing ge-
 expressed by кal $\tau \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\rho} \eta a \tau a-\mu \in i \nu y$; and as the former denotes continuance in, communion in general, so this denotes, specially, steadfastness in assenting to and accepting the doctrines and instructions of Christ, especially in the present discourses, wherein he taught them the nature of his person and office. The benefit promised in $\%$ tai -i $\dot{\nu} \mu i \nu$, is nearly allied to that at Matt. xxi. 21. where see Note. The whatever must, of course, be limited to whatever is necessary for the purpose adverted to in the preceding and following verses, namely, their bringing forth much fruit, and the promotion thereby of the glory of God.
8. $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta o \xi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \eta$ ] The Aorist is here taken as at V.6., where see Note. "I $\nu a$ is put for ört, quod, as iii. 23. iv.17. and often. The cal is not, as most Commentators suppose, for olives or ore, but we must repeat dy roúre from the preceding

 meant really be. See Note supra xiii. 19. On the doctrine included in this verse see Titty. in Recens. Synop.
 proceeds to remind them of his own singular
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love to them, and holds out for their imitation his own crample in doing the work of the Father. Ka0ws and cal may be rendered quantoperetantopere. ('littm.) Others, as Lampe, take the sense to be as-so. Others, again, take the кaөmis to signify since; and the кal they regard as 2 simple copula; which would require a comma after $\dot{\mathbf{v}} \mu \hat{\alpha} s$. But the foregoing interpretation is preferable. The words $\mu$ нivate- $\mu \bar{\eta}$ are explained by most Commentators, ' continue in the love of me,' or 'to love me.' But that sense can only be tolerated, on the change of punctuation just mentioned. Both, however, are liable to much objection. And it is better, with others, to suppose the sense to be, 'Continue to be beloved by me,' ' keep your place in $m y$ affections.' This interpretation is satisfactorily established by Campl.
Then are mentioned the means by which they shall continue to possess his love, namely, by keeping His commandments after the example which He had set them, by keeping His Father's.
11. $\left.\tau_{\nu \alpha} \dot{\eta} \chi^{\alpha \rho \alpha}-\pi \lambda_{\eta \rho \omega} \theta_{\bar{\eta}}\right]$ i.e., as the best Commentators explain, that my joy in you [at your love, faith, and obedience] might be enduring, and that your joy [in continuing in my love] may be complete and perfect.' See xvi. 24 \& 33. xvii. 13. J Joh. i. 4. 2 Joh. xii. X X $\rho \dot{\alpha}$ ìv ijuiv denotes 'joy felt on your account.' Tittm. has ably shown how the words may, by accommodation, be applied to the Pastors and Teachers of the Church of Christ in every age.
12. aijin doriv-i $\mu \bar{\alpha} \varepsilon$ ] These words are meant to show what sort of love is evinced by Him to them, and consequently expected in return. A similar argument is used at xiv. $5 \&$ 21. See also Matth. xx. 28. Rom. v. Y \& 8. 1 Joh. iii. 16. As instances of this degree of attachment from a friend, Grot. adduces the cases of Pylades and Orestes, and Damon and Pythias. I would add the yet more apposite one of Alcestis, so finely represented in the inimitable drama of.Euripides. See v. 155. ж $\hat{\omega}^{\circ} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \cdot \mu \bar{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$
 ن́тep日avGiv;
14. Here Christ shows how that friendship may be evinced, namely, as in the love before mentioned, by keeping his commandments.
 is not very clearly developed, and may best be expressed by the following translation and paraphrase. '[I say frionds] for I no longer style you servants, for the servant [differeth from the friend inasmuch as he] knoweth not what his master doeth, i.e. his plans of action. But you I call frieuds, [and well I may] since whatsoever

1 have learned from my Father I have made known to you, thus treating you with the most unreserved confidence.' Some exceptions have been made to the words taken in their ordinary and full acceptation, by several recent Commentators, who, because Christ had before (Lu. xii. 4.) called them his friends, and had always treated his disciples with affability and kindness, would take oúкย́тı for oúк, and $\lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega$ in the sense of a Preterite, per Enallagen! But that is a figure not to be resorted to ad libitum, and as a Bcos $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta \mu \eta X^{a \nu \eta s}$ in cases of difficulty. And the use of ouкért for oúk is somewhat precarious. Lampe'sarguments for the common interpretation, though not all equally cogent, are yet sufficient to defend it. Our Lord had certainly, up to this time, (agreeably to the custom of the Jewish Rabbies) culled them servants, though he had not treated them as such. And the term is susceptible of a milder interpretation, considering the connexion of disciple with master; and thus it is interchanged with סıd́кovos at Joh. xii. 26. The words of Luke will only prove that Christ addressed them as friends. And certain it is that He had never before erpressly styled them his Friends.

From xvi. 12. it is clear, that the тáyra must (as the best Commentators are agreed) be understood restrictively, i. e. of all things proper for them then to know. The disciples here present were (as Tittm. observes) the esoteric, those interioris admissionis, as opposed to the eroteric the ol ".. $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{cm}}$. Compare Matt. xiii. 11. Mark xiii. 11. Lu. viii. 10. With the former he used the most unreserved communication.
16. où $\dot{\boldsymbol{u}} \mu \in i \bar{s}-\dot{v} \mu \bar{\kappa} \varepsilon]$ This is meant to excite them to gratitude and obedience, as showing them that the obligation was all on their side. For $k \kappa \lambda d \gamma \in \sigma \theta a!$ may here (as often) be taken not so much of choice, as of the love which it implies; antecedent being put for consequent ; as Mark xiii. 20. Acts xiii. 17. 1 Cor. i. 27 \& 28. Eph. i. 4. James ii. 5. Tı日évat, like the Hebr. םw, and the corresponding terms in most languages, has often the sense appoint. ' $\mathbf{Y}_{\boldsymbol{\pi}}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \epsilon$ is regarded by most Commentators as pleonastic. It is not, however, quite so, but conveys a notion of seal in the discharge of their functions as Apostles or Teachers. For that is what is meant by the
 $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \eta$ point at the ulterior effects of these labours to succeeding ages, and which, judging by events, we now know must endure unto the end of the world. In the words following the iva denotes event, result, or consequence. The sense is: - Thus it shall happen, that whatever ye shall ask the Father,' \&xc.
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17. In this verse our Lord, I conceive, means to say, that He has given them the injunctions he has, with the hope and trust that they will so fulfil them as to love each other; concord being essential to their spiritual success.
18. From the above injunction of mutual love, our Lord passes to the kindred subject of the hatred of the world towards them, forewarning them of the evils they would have to endure in his cause, exhorting them to patient endurance, and consoling them by reminding them of the treatment $H e$ had experienced in his own case; 4. d. 'If $m y$ blameless and most beneficial life could not shield me from the hatred and mortal persecution of the world, (i.e. of the unbelieving and wicked part of it) so neither will your's protect you.' Many Commentators take yıעéscere as an Imperative, in the sense reflect, consider. But the common view, by which it is considered as an Indicative, is most natural.
 as Campo. has convincingly shown. But it is strange that he should have styled the interprecation ' your Chief' a novel one, and introduced by Dr. Lardner; whereas, as appears from Lampe, and even Pole's Synopsis, it was adopted by many antient Fathers and modern Commentators uninterruptedly down to the time of Lardner. The Doctor's memory certainly did deceive him. But in such a case no memory should be relied on, but reference be made to books. It was, indeed, the want of that diligent reference to the labours of other men, that preference of drawing from the ample, but not always well assorted, stores of his own capacious mind, and that excessine reliance on a judgment by no means in proportion to his acuteness and penetration, which has much detracted from the value of Dr . Campbell's excellent work.
19. el er той \&c.] ' $\mathrm{B} к$ той ко́бноу elva signifies 'to be conformed to the world.' So dx roü Өcoû or diaßpoliou, \&c. For (as Grot. observes) the $\mathrm{tk}_{\mathrm{k}}$, as it denotes descent from, so it may very well import affinity to.
 24. Job. xiii. 16.
 these words seems to be directly contrary to that
which the context requires. To remove this difficulty, some would take inpeì for papain$\rho \in i v$. But for that sense of $\tau \eta \rho \in i \nu$ with $\tau \delta \nu$ خóyov there is no authority. The same remarks will apply to that method of interpretation (objectionable on other grounds) which is founded on the use of el to signify as. The best mode of removing the difficulty hitherto propounded is that of Ruin. and Titty., who assign the following sense. 'If they had admitted and observed my doctrine, they would admit and observe your's.' Yet it involves such an anomaly of language as we may reasonably hesitate to ascribe to the Evangelist ; because, though inattentive to the nicer properties of the language, yet be no where so openly sets all rules at defiance. Not to say that the use of the tenses in the antithetical clause forbids this. If we would arrive at the truth, we must not tamper with the sense of any word, nor with the proper force of the tenses, but seek some mode of explanation which may involve any such anomaly. This may, I conceive, in the present instance, be done by considering the affirmative enunciation as dependent on the hypothetical el as meant to imply also its negative, i. e. 'If they have not observed my words, neither will they observe your's.' On examination, I find that Euthym. and some of the early modern Commentators took the words as equivalent to a negative sentence; but how this arose, they seem not have been aware.
 - for your attachment to me.' And, therefore, what they do to you I regard as done to myself. Oui oidagt. This imports not involuntary ignorance, but wilful blindness as to the true nature of the evidence of a Divine legation.
22. al $\mu \grave{\eta} \dot{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$ \& c .] The words of this v . are exegetical of the preceding, and our Lord (as Lampe observes) "therein encounters a tacit argument in excuse of the persons in question, that they sinned from ignorance. This he overturns, by showing that their ignorance and perverseness were inexcusable, because sufficient means for the attainment of a knowledge of the truth had been provided both by internal and external evidence, in doctrines and in miracles." 'A $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ арт. must not be taken (with many) of $\sin$ in
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general, but of the sin in question, that of rejecting the Messiah. From the antithetical clause yiv de exouat, \&c. it appears that the sense here is, 'they would have been, comparatively, innocent of the sin,' 'there would have been some excuse for them.'
 dicate, under a general assertion, the sinfulness of their conduct, namely, that their hatred and rejection of Him and his mission, and injurious treatment of Him, was, in fact, done to His Father. In the next v. the assertion of v.22. is resumed, (the words of $v .23$. being in some measure parenthetical) and the proof of Divine mission from miracles is adverted to. Then a conclusion is drawn. Or, as Lampe observes, "we have a conditional proposition so assumed that, from a refutation of the antecedent, there results a refutation of the consequent." The sense may be thus, more plainly, expressed : ‘ But now, although these miracles have been wrought before their eyes, yet they have only produced hatred and injurious conduct towards me, a conduct (agreeably to the foregoing assurance) directed against my Father likewise.' In this is implied the consequence above expressed at v .22 .
 By feqa are here meant not the doctrines, as some interpret, nor the miracles and doctrines, as others imagine, but simply the miracles, as the antient Commentators and, of the modern ones, Tittm. maintain.
 tators maintain that the sense is, 'But this is come to pass that the Scripture might be fulfilled;' while the later and more eminent ones are of opinion that the lya is here, as often, eventual, and that the sense is: ' Now by this having come to pass the words written in the Law were made good.' The words in question were properly spoken of the enemies of David. But as David was a type of Christ, so they are accommodated to Him. Tittm. observes that the saying of Scripture is confirmed by experience, namely, that, in return for love, hatred, instead of benefits, ill turns are often repaid.
26. д̈rav $\dot{d} \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \theta_{\eta} \dot{\delta} \dot{\delta} \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \kappa$.] The connexion here is uncertain ; 'but it is most probable, (as Kuin. and Tittm. suppose) that the words were spoken with the view of softening an ungrateful
communication, by a promise of Divine assistance, and the aid of the Holy Spirit ; q. d. 'Though rejected by the multitude, 1 am acknowledged as Messiah by the Father, who, in proof of this, will shortly send you the aids of the Holy Spirit.' On the going forth of the Paraclete, as truth from the Father, Tittm. ap. Rec. Syn. has much excellent matter, to which 1 must be content to refer my readers.

- $\mu$ apтupíget жegl i $\mu \overline{\text { ü }}$ ] This is explained by almost all recent Commentators of confirming by arguments what has been taught. Thus the sense is : ‘ The Holy Spint will cause that my person, fortunes, counsels, deeds, and works, shall be more and more known,' or, as it is said in xvi.
 cannot admit of that sense; and that the usual signification of $\mu a \rho \tau u \rho \in i \nu \nu$ is here to be adopted, is plain from the next verse; for we can hardly suppose the word used in two such different senses in so short a space. The true interpretation seems to be that of the antients and earlier moderns, i.e. ' the Holy Spirit will bear witness to my Messiahship by the miraculous Spiritual gifts with which he will endow believers in me.'

27. To the testimony of the Holy Spirit Christ adds that of the apostles and disciples themselves, who were, in all respects, qualifed to bear irrefragable testimony to the person, character, and actions of Christ, as having been with him from the beginning of his Ministry; a testimony so much the more weighty, since it was, in the case of some, confimed by personal miracles, and in others brought forward in writing, by the Gospels.
 бкavdàcoөñvat, who, either stumbling at the external poverty and lowliness of our Lord, formed a wrong judgment of him, and at least doubted of his Divine mission; or who, though convinced of it, suffered themselves to be so influenced by the apprehension of evil, as to abandon their Christian profession. (Tittm.)
 'A入入a, quin imò, nay; ""Lцa for öтe, as often. 'Epxerat, ' is coming, ' ' will soon come.'
 perly signifies to serve any one as a slave. But in the N.T. and LXX. it is always used to denote the offering of sacrifice, and renderiog worship and service of any kind. The sense is: 'he












may think he is rendering an acceptable service to (iod.' Here Lampe aptly adduces the follow. ing sentiment of a Rabbinical writer: "Omnis effundens sanguinem improborum equalis est illi qui sacrificium effert." "These and such like adages (says Campb.) show how justly the Jews are represented by our Lord." The greatest enormities recorded in Josephus were perpetrated by the zelota. Doddr. thinks there is here an allusion to such sort of deeds as the assassination of Paul, planned by the forty conspirators, (see Acts xxiiii. 14. sq.) and in which they gloried.
 such conduct to its original source, and to suggest consolation to themselves, as suffering in the cause of God and Christ. See xv. 21. 'T ${ }^{\prime}$ нiv after morij. is omitted in very many MsS., Versions, Fathers, and early Edd., and is, with some reason, cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Tittm., 「at., and Scholz.
28. $\eta$ © © $\rho a]$ i.e. the time for suffering such calamities.

- raüta-oùk elxov] By $\dot{e} \xi, \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \bar{\eta} s$ is meant the beginning of Christ's ministry. And in using the expression öँт، $\mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime}$ í $\mu \bar{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$ our Lord speaks of himself as already departed, since he is on the point of leaving them. Of this there are several examples in the Classical


 Lord had apprized his disciples of the persecutions they would have to undergo on account of their Christian profession, we may take the oik cixoy (as many do) restricticely. Or rather as raüra may very well mean the things which should befall them after their Lord's departure, and as Christ had no where dwelt on those evils, so that may be the sense here. This, indeed, is placed beyond doubt by the words following, which suggest the reason why Christ did not do it; namely, because he was then with them, to comfort and support them, and himself to bear the brunt of those trials.

5. עüv $\delta \dot{d} \dot{j} \pi d \gamma \omega \in \mathbb{c}$.] The Commentators are not agreed on the scope of these words, and consequently differ on the punctuation. They are generally considered as containing a new subject, namely, that of his departure, (see Lampe) and the following sense is assigned: ' But now
that I am going to Him who sent me, none of you asketh, ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{\& c}$. But thus the кal is silenced; and the sentiment in the preceding words taïтa $\delta \ell-\epsilon i \pi o \nu$ is left very deficient. And though $\delta \dot{d}$ has sometimes a transitive force, yet the context must decide where that is to be ascribed. It is better (with Grot., Wakef., Kuin., Tittm., and Vat.) to suppose the words to be connected with the preceding clause. Thus the $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ will be, as very often, adversatice. There is, however, something left, per aposiopesin, to be supplied, q.d. 'And therefore $I$ have thought it necessary to tell you,' or something similar. The кal in the words following signifies 'And [yet], i.e. though I am going;' a signification frequent in St. John's writings. By $\dot{\ell} \omega \omega \tau \hat{a}$ is meant $\nu \bar{u} \nu$ $\dot{\text { cepmeă ; for they had asked before. The dis- }}$ ciples are, however, I conceive, reproved, not so much for not then asking, as for the feeling which occasioned it, namely, sorrow. This is hinted at in v. 6. Their sorrow was blameable, as proceeding from want of refiection on the causes of his departure, the place whither he was going, and the purpose of it, though these had been before suggested to them. However, our Lord in vv. 7-11. again adverts thereto, and in plainer terms.
6. бuдф́¢ $\rho \in \dot{v} \mu i v]$ On the highly beneficial effects to the A postles of Christ's departure, see Tittm. ap. Recens. Synop. "The Holy Spirit (observes he) effected much more in them than Christ himself had done, (see v. 12, 14, \& 16.) imparting to them a more complete knowledge of Christ than what He himself could communicate, and also many other excellent gifts necessary for their Apostolic function; supplying eloquence irresistible, the power of working the most illustrious miracles for the confrmation of their testimony concerning. Jesus, and rendering their imbecile and timid minds strong (nay, in-, vincible) to all the terrors of their adversaries." "It was (says Euthym.) the pleasure of the Holy Trinity that the Father should draw them to the Son, the Son should teach them, and the Holy Spirit perfect them. Now the two first things were already completed, but still it was necessary for the third to be accomplished, namely, the being perfected by the IIoly Spirit."
7. èéरहet-крioccos] This is a passage of considerable difficulty, and therefore it is no wonder that the Commentators should not be
h Supr. 12. ${ }_{31}$.

 той кóтцои тойтоv кéкрятаь.




agreed on its sense. Some take $\tau \boldsymbol{\delta} \nu \kappa \delta \dot{\sigma} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu}$ to mean the world at large; others, the Jews only. And according as they adopt one or the other view, they assign to the passage either a general, or a particulur sense. The former is ably supported by Lampe : and the latter is maintained by most recent Commentators, especially Kuin. and Tittm., who assign the following as the sense : - He will show clearly, 1. the great sin of the Jews in rejecting me, by the conversion of many thousands of Jews through the effusion of the Spirit; 2. that I was really just and innocent, by teaching through the Apostles that God hath received me into heaven; 3. that the opposition made to me by the rulers of this world is in vain, as my religion will prevail; and that their policy will be judged and condemned.' This seems, from the following vv ., to be the most correct view. But exception may be taken to some points of the exposition, and others may be doubtful. For since (as Mr. Rose ap. Parkh. in v. has seen) "whether the world be taken in its limited, or in its restricted sense, it is to be its own judge, the sense of $\bar{\lambda}$ é $\gamma \xi \in \iota$ must be convince, not convict ; those two terms, when applied to a fault, only differing in this, that the individual may be himself convinced of his fault, but is convicted of it in the judgment of others." How this convincement was effected, and to what extent, is taught us by the N. T. and the early Ecclesiastical writers. See Acts ii. 14. By the $\dot{\alpha} \mu \alpha \rho \tau i \alpha$ is meant not only the sin of unbelief, but of persecuting and finally crucifying the Lord of life, and endeavouring to suppress the religion of God.

With respect to the meaning of repl $\delta$ tкatooúvins, all the best Commentators are agreed that it must belong to Christ, reepl denoting quod attinet ad : and, taken in conjunction with the words following, סıкаเooúvŋ must, as the best Commentators (especially Tittm.) think, denote the innocence and holiness of Jesus, the Author of justification by his blood. The proof of this (adverted to in the words following) was his going to His Father in heaven, evinced by his resurrection, and also by his sending the Holy Spirit with miraculous gifts. See Acts ii. 2. sq. xvii. 31. Rom. i. 4. 1 Cor. xv. 14. sq. In тepl крígecos the тrepl must be taken in the same sense, and the purport of the phrase be determined by the words following, which show it to be the Divine judgment and condemnation, i.e. the condemnation of the unbelieving part of the world, whether Jews, as at first, or Heathens. The certainty of this is hinted at v.11. by the inention of the condemnation of the $\dot{d} \dot{d} \rho \times \infty \nu$ rov aidamov, which expression does not, I conceive, dennote the body of the Jewish rulers, chief F'rimula, \&i. \&c., as most recent Commentators mainiain; but (as I have shown is also the sense
at xii. 31.) Satun. For by the manifestation of the Holy Spirit in all His miraculous gifts and wonderful effects, the Author of $\sin$ was condemned, and his power subverted. And if he was condemned, so would his followers, whether Jews or Gentiles, be condemned, and judgment and punishment be executed on them, both in this world and in the next. At the same time, the passage may, by accommodation, be applied to the operation of the Holy Spirit on the hearts of men in every age. See the excellent observations of Mr. Scott.
12. mod $\lambda \dot{\alpha}$ ] ' many other doctrines,' namely, as the Commentators say, the abrogation of the Ceremonial law, the removal of the distinction between Jews and Gentiles. But there is reference, no doubt, also to those more mysterious and spiritual doctrines, such as justification by faith, which the Spirit of truth afterwards revealed to St. Paul. Baनrá乌etv, like the Latin ferre, often signifies (as here) to comprehend; and the same metaphor is found in our understaved.
13. dкeivos] Spoken emphatically to denote the Paraclete before mentioned, V. 7. In $\tau \boldsymbol{d}$ $\pi \nu \in \bar{v} \mu \alpha$ vis $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta$. there is (as Grot. observes) the figure $\pi \rho d s$ тd $\sigma \eta \mu a, \nu \delta \mu \in \nu o v$. It is, however, of more importance to remark on this among so many other proofs in this Gospel, of the personality of the Holy Spirit, namely, from personal actions being ascribed to him.
 Synop., I preferred to the common version that of Campb., Wets., and Newc., 'into all the truth.' This, I have since found, is adopted by Bp. Middlet., who remarks that $\alpha \lambda r \mid \theta \in i a$ here denotes not truth universally, but only in reference to the particular subject. He does not seem, however, to have been aware that the force of Tiv $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$. had been long ago pointed out by Le Clerc in his Ars Crit. ii. 1.2., where he adduces other examples from Joseph. Bell. viii. and Plato Apolog., in which Socrates thus addresses his judges:
 I would render, 'the whole truth,' i.e. without any thing being kept back, as at present, from circumstances. Our Lord seems to have had in view,

 Lord speaks of the Holy Spirit after the manner of men, as of a Legate, who ought to say nothing but what he has been instructed by his principal; g.d. "The instruction delivered by the Holy Spirit will not be ' $\phi^{\prime}$ ' $\dot{\text { cavtoū }}$, suo arbitrio, but after the injunctions and the will of the Father; and therefore most true and divine. Nay, moreover, he will not only open out to you the whole truth of things past, but also, as often as need
 'he will predict things future, and of which il have said nothing to you,' (Tittm.) namely,














what shall happen either to the world at large, or to the Jewish people, or to the Church. See Acts xi. 28. xiii. 2. xx. 23, 28. xxi. 11. Eph. iv. 11. 1 Tim. iv. 1. 2 Tim. iii. 1. 2 Pet. i. 14. (Grot.) 'Avayyendecv signifies to deliver or relate as a message; and sometimes, as here, to make known by information from another.
14. èкeivos $\dot{d} \mu \dot{d} \delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \xi$. \&c.]. The scope of the words seems to be, to show that in all the Holy Spirit shall reveal and teach, He will have in view the glory of Christ, or, that all which He teaches will tend to that.
15. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau a \ddot{\ddot{\partial} \sigma a}$ E $\chi \in \iota-\sigma \sigma \tau \iota$ ] These words (as Tittm. has shown) import, that there is the most intimate connexion, and perfect community of counsel, will, feeling, energy, and operation, between the Father, and the Son, and consequently the cause of the latter is that of God. Lampe truly remarks, that this whole passage is excellently adapted to establish the whole doctrine of the majesty of the Trinity against the Socinians. "For (continues he) here are three persons expressly distinguished from each other, and yet among them the closest connexion is said to subsist. The glory ascribed to them is equal; and yet this by no means precludes the supposition that the Son is the Heir of the Father, and the Holy Spirit the legate of both."

- dia тойто єiँои) i.e. it was in this sense that I said.
 ėтtal as in Hos. i. 4. Kal, for öтe, 'and [then]." Oi $\begin{aligned} & \text { ececoeits. Pres. for Fut. This is }\end{aligned}$ a strong, but delicate form of expression to denote absence by death. The words $\mu \iota \kappa \rho d y$, кal $\delta \psi$ eróe $\mu$ are meant to minister consolation to them. "O $O$ écóé $\mu \epsilon$ is for $\pi \dot{d} \lambda \iota \nu o \partial \psi$., spoken of his visible advent after the resurrection. The
 torily explained by any Commentator. It should seem to be an elliptical mode of expression, of which the sense is: '[I use this language] because I am going to the Father.' Indeed though speaking of going, and then coming shortly, would suggest the idea of only a temporary stay; yet it would not do that clearly enough to be understood until after the event; which is all that our Lord intended. Then it would serve to confirm their faith, as it now cheered their sorrow.

17. $\tau \boldsymbol{i}$ غ்тт тои̃тo, \&c.] It has been thought surprising that the Apostles should have failed to comprehend the words of our Lord. But the thing is easily accounted for, when we consider their conciseness and mnigmatical cast; that they were predictice, perhaps intentionally obscure, and only to be understood after their fulfilment. Besides, the Apostles' perceptions were clouded by deep-rooted prejudices as to the temporal nature of Christ's kingdom, and dulled by their excess of sorrow on learning that, whatever might be the full sense of the words, they were, at least, to be deprived of their Lord. Their greatest perplexity, no doubt, was with the
 were not likely to understand in the true sense. They might, indeed, comprehend that they were first to be deprived of, and then to receive back their Lord; but as they firmly believed that the Messiah was to come and establish an earthly kingdom, they could make nothing out of the last words. At v. 18. the sense of roüro- $\boldsymbol{r} \delta$ $\mu เ \kappa \rho \delta \nu$, has been ill represented in most translations, from inattention to the Article, which is correctly expressed in the Syriac Version. The
 $\mu$ мкро́v; Render, 'What meaneth this little $u$ hile which he speaketh of? Oíx otioare, \&c. 'we know not what he is speaking of.' The $\tau i$ refers to the whole sentence in question.
These words of the A postles to each other are, with reason, supposed by Heumann to have been pronouced after having stepped aside.
18. тepl тоútou Ynтeíce \&c.] This sentence is by most regarded as interrogative; by others as declarative. The former is the more natural mode of interpretation; the latter, the more suitable to our Lord, as knowing all hearts, and being well acquainted both with what they had been saying, and their desire for information, for which, however, they dared not ask. Compare v. 30. The sense is: 'So then you are debating,' \&c.
 not, for the reason above mentioned, give any erplanation. And thus by his silence he meant to say: "What I have said you will find true." However, in order to make a further impression on their minds, and suggest ground for comfort,
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he points to the circumstances which should accompany the events in question; namely, the sorrow of his disciples, and the triumphant exultation of the world, at first ; and the grief of the disciples soon afterwards to be turned into joy, "quasi post nubila Phahus."
21. Our Lord here illustrates what he has just said by a simile familiar to the Hebrew writers, (as Is. xxi. 3. xxvi. 17. xxxvii. 3. Jer. iv. 31', xxii. 23. xxx. 6.), and not unknown in the Classical ones. See Hom. 1liad. a. 269. Tiктetv in the Classical writers signifies to bear children ; but in the Hellenistic ones mostly (as here) to be in travail. It is, however, sometimes in Hippocrates interchanged with кúctv. $\Lambda \dot{u} \pi \eta \nu$ éXes. The sense may be, 'is sorrowful;' though the best Commentators, antient and modern, take it to be ' $1 s$ in pangs,' 'is suffering pangs.' "Av$\theta$ 0wios signifies here a human being, without reference to sex. Perhaps $d \nu \theta \rho$. may be for os $a \nu \theta \rho$., ' the child.'
22. é $\chi \in \tau e$ and aipet are Presents for Futures.
 nifying. ' ye shall feel heartfelt joy.' By Tivy
 that their joy should be uninterrupted and permanent, not liable to be taken away, as all joy founded on human affairs must be.
 joins what would tend to repress their anxiety for the explanation which he had thought fit not to give them, by intimating that in that day of joy they would have no occasion to put questions on the subject, 'Ye will have nothing to ask me.' For
 has been seen by some antient and many modern Commentators. On the subject of putting questions, Christ engrafts that of preferring requests. and shows that whatever else they might need; or have to ask for, in His cause, whether Spiritual
illumination, or courage in action, the Father would deny them nothing.
 count, or, for my cause, ${ }^{\text {as }}$ as many eminent Commentators explain. Hamm. and Lampe, however, have adduced good reasons for supposing that the sense may be, 'by my mediation,' through me, as Mediator between God and man.
 ; ye have only to ask and receive, to have your joy complete.'
25. Christ here gives a reason why he had spoken obscurely. Eע maporiats, darkly and figuratively, containing more than is expressed. and not easy to be understood by the uninformed and unreflecting. To this is opposed the avaryé $\lambda$ 入civ $\pi a \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \eta \sigma i a$, to speak perspicuously and without the involvements of figurative allusion. I would here compare the words of Xschyl.
 ík alviरuáтcoy. By тaüтa is meant all that Christ had said in the preceding discourses. The fulfilment of this promise is alluded to at Lu. xxiv. 26-44. \& Acts i. 3.
26-28. In these verses are set forth the advantages resulting to them from this fuller knowledge: 'At that time (i.e. when I shall have more fully taught you concerning my Father, his counsels, and decrees) ye shall addrese your prayers in my name, and shall receive benefits of the most excellent kind.' (Tittm.)
 xiv. 16. promised that he will ask the Father on their behalf, and as we have just after, xvii. 9. seqq., an actual intercession for them, and as Christ is at Rom. viii. 34. Hebr. vii. 25. and 1 Joh. ii. 1. said to be continually interceding for his disciples, the sense of the words must be, not what they would at first seem to express, but what has been assigned by the most eminent Interpreters










for the last century, namely, 'I need not say that 1 shall pray the Father for you, since you know I will do that, [nay, there is no need, in another respect] for the Father Himself loveth you.' This idiom has the technical name proteritio, and is to be found even in the Classical writers. The omission of the clause suspended on $\gamma{ }^{\alpha} \rho$ is common in the N.T. Aüros is for
 to be taken as Presents. On the full sense of $\dot{i} \xi \bar{\eta} \lambda \forall о \nu$ т $\alpha \rho \dot{\alpha}$ той $\pi a \tau$. compare i. 18. iii. 13 a 31. , vi. 62. and see the Notes of Lame and Tittm. in Recess. Synop.
30. עüv oiòa $\mathcal{1} \nu$ \&c.]. See v. 19, and Note. We may paraphrase: Now we experimentally know that to thee all the thoughts, wishes, and desires of men are open, and therefore cannot doubt of thy divine mission.' To the Prophets, and especially to the Messiah, the Jews always ascribed supernatural knowledge of the thoughts of men.
31. ar $\rho$ to $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \in \dot{v e r e] ~ C h r i s t ~ h e r e ~ c h e c k s ~ t h e i r ~}$ excessive confidence, and inculcates diffidence in their own strength. The interrogation here, as often, involves a strong negation. "A pet signifies ergone jam?
32. кal $\nu \bar{\nu} \nu$ d $\left.\lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda u \theta_{e \nu}\right]$ 'nay is now come.' At iobıa sub. oiкпjдата. So 1 Macc. vi. 54.
 There is a similar passage in Home. Odis. a.
 ävax $\theta_{c}$. where Didymus explains $\sigma \phi e ́ \tau e \rho a$ by $\tau \dot{\alpha}$ idea, and $\sigma \kappa i \delta$. by $\sigma к о \rho \pi i \zeta$ er $\theta \alpha \iota$. As, however, in the present passage olkimata is to be understood, we may more appositely compare Hon.
 ікабтот.

- cal our el pl \& c.] The sal has here, as often, the sense and yet; and in $\mu \in \cos ^{\alpha}$ ' $\mu$ out there is an allusion to the double meaning of the phrase. It here denotes to be any one's supporter. See Note on viii. 29.

33. Taüra] The recent Commentators too much limit the sense of the word, as if referring only to what was just said. It must, with the antient and some eminent modern Commentators, be taken of the whole of what had been said in the preceding discourse, which, it seems, our Lord delivered for the purpose of supplying them with grounds of support under the evils, which they would speedily encounter, and perpetually have to grapple with. See Lampe and Doddr.

- dy d $\mu o l$ ] i.e. by faith in me, and reliance od my protection. Elprivnv, tranquillity of mind.
consolation, and comfort, (which he had so solemnly bequeathed them at xiv. 27.) alone to be attained through Him "who is our Peace.", See Eph. ii. 14. Өapoeitc, 'take courage.' So $\theta a \rho \sigma \epsilon \iota$ occurs in Homs. 11. w. 171. \& o. 254.
 by Ruin. and Tittm., that this is the prophetic Preterite, for the Future. Nix. signifies 'to foil and frustrate.' Kó opus here denotes the unbelieving and persecuting part of the world, combined under their leader the $\dot{\delta} \dot{\alpha} \rho \times \infty \nu$ to Toúrou, the Devil, to destroy the cause of the Gospel. By saying that He hath overcome (for the $\dot{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{y}^{\circ}$ is emphatic ) our Lord hints, for their encouragement, that by the same all powerful aid (that of the Father, (See v. 32.) and His own, and the IIoly Spirit's, ) they might also come of more than conquerors in the day of tribulation and persecution. See Rom. viii. 37. 1 Cor. xv. 57. 2 Cor. ii. 14. 1 Joh. iv. 4. and the excellent Notes of Lampe and Mr. Scott.
XVII. After concluding the above discourse, Christ addresses himself in prayer to God, to whose protection he now commends his own cause, and that of his disciples. The prayer in question is (as Titty. observes) such, that, "had we no other knowledge of Christ than what was furnished thence, it would be sufficient to show us the supreme dignity of his person, his exalted magnanimity, his ardent love to man, and the momentous consequences of the work He was effecting. He bestows not a thought on the cruel and ignominious death which was at hand, but is wholly intent on the salvation of men. To that alone are his thoughts and prayers directed. Even what he asks the father, he, at the same time, refers to that sole end, the salvation of men."
Lamp thinks, that the primary intent of this prayer was, to console the disciples. I cannot but think that it was equally so to instruct them, to set them an example of fortitude and resignation, as well as prayer to God under circum. stances of peril, affliction, and distress ; finally, to teach Christians of all ages to commit them:selves and all their concerns to the Providence of that God who "watcheth over them." This may very well serve to account for the variation of manner in different parts of the prayer; for though, throughout the whole, Christ speaks as the incarnate Son of God, yet he sometimes supplicates as Man; at others he speaks as the Mediator of his people, but not unfrequently expresses himself with Divine majesty and authority.

1. ̇बचipe rove dфөa入. a. e. т. o.] On this
attitude of reverent devotion, as well as that of lifting up the hands, not unfrequently alluded to also in the Classical writers, see Elsn. and Lampe.
2. $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \rho]$ On the peculiar sense in which the word is here to be tahen, see Lampe. Moreover, Christ is to be considered as praying according to his human nature; for as Schoettg. observes, "in his state of erinanition, having emptied limself of his glory, Christ is considered as a subject fulfilling the orders of his Monarch, namely, God. Therefore to the Triune God, as his Lord and Master, Christ might direct his prayers.'. 'Eג $\dot{\eta} \lambda u \theta \in \nu$ मे $\ddot{\omega} \rho a$, , i.e. the decisive and appointed time, the time in which the glory both of the Father and the Son should be manifested. The word is elsewhere so employed in the N.T., and almost always of a period ushering in calamity.
 into the glory He originally had in Heaven." On the nature of that glory, how it was manifested in Heaven, developed on earth, and revealed to men; also how the Father was glorified by the Son, in all His attributes, and in the whole work of salvation, see the excellent Notes of Lampe and Tittm. in Kecens. Synop.
 gests the reason and cause of the prayer here offered; our Lord refers both his own glory and that of' his Father to the work of salvation com. mitted to him. Käwis, 'inasmuch as, since.'
 all men.' A Hellenistic use of the Genit. Mäa $\sigma \alpha \rho \xi$ is a frequent Hebraism. Mầ. Neut. for masc., by a usage frequent in the Classical writers. It is also considered by Kypke and Kuin. as a nomin. absol., or an accus. for dat., and avirois as redundant, the plural being referred to the sing. $\pi \bar{\alpha} \nu$, by the figure $\pi \rho d s \tau^{\delta} \sigma \eta \mu a \iota \nu \delta_{-}^{-}$ $\mu \in \nu o \nu$. But Lampe, with reason, objects to this pleonasm and enallage of number. The pleonasm (as often) is energetic, and therefore no pleonasm. And the enallage may be, as he says, emphatic. It should, however, seem best not too anxiously to press on such constructions, nor too elaborately to discuss them on the principles of Classical and finished construction; but to consider them as anacolutha, such as are found in the popular phraseology of almost all languages. On the doign, a sort of Subjunct. future, see Win. Gr. Gr. \$10.1.9. Note. But to turn from words to things. On the full extent of this august power claimed by our Lord, Tittm. has shown, that it involves the governance of all human affairs, the regulation of the vicissitudes of times, and places, \&c. \&c. And all this in order to accomplish the work of human salvation. Dominion of this kind over the whole universe is elsewhere claimed by our Lord, (see Matth. xxviii. 18.) and ascribed to Him by St. Paul, Eph. i. 20. seqq. "This work (continues he) the Father committed to Him, as the Saviour of men, in order that he who obtained that salyation, might be the giver of it." With the sentiment in lya $\pi \bar{a} \nu-a l \omega^{2} \nu \circ \nu$ compare a kindred one at Acts vii. 25. Tittm. has well pointed out that this domimion of Christ consists not only (as many recent

Commentators imagine) in teaching, \&c. but in giving eternal life, purchased by His death. Indeed, Christ might be said to give eternal life, by giving and promulgating that Gospel which reveals it. It was the will of the Father that this life should be bestowed on the world by His Son. Hence salvation can alone be attained by faith in that Son as well as in the Father, and, moreover, that kind of faith which the revelation of God has taught us.
 tation of this verse the utmost care is requisite, since from it senses the very opposite have been sought. It has ever been regarded by the Heterodox as one of their chief strong-holds, and from this they have boldly ventured to impugn the doctrine of the Deity of Christ. To effectually frustrate their attenpt, many eminent $\mathrm{Or}^{-}$ thodox Commentators, antient and modern, lay down such a construction of the sentence, as
 belong not only to the Father, but also to the Son. This they seek to effect in two ways, 1. by inverting the natural order of the words, thus: - Ut te, et quem misisti Jesum Christum, solam verum Deum agnoscant.' 2. by supposing an ellipsis of eivat, and after sal supplying äдa vor. But the best Commentators for above a centary have been agreed, that this transposition and supplying of uords involves so much violence, that the interpretation founded thereon cannot be admitted. Indeed, as Bp. Middlet. observes, " it could only have originated in a wish to evade the consequences which this text has been supposed to establish." We must not, then, seek here an assertion of the Deity of Christ, but content ourselves with proving that Christ is not here represented as a mere Legate, much less a mere man. That our Lord did not, could not, mean to make such an assertion, is plain both from the pessage itself, and from what precedes and follows it. See Tittm. in Recens. Synop.
In determining the true sense of the passage it is of importance to ascertain what is the exact
 That will mainly depend on the construction, about which the Commentators are not agreed. There are two classes of Interpreters who suppose an ellipsis of eIval. But that cannot be admitted, since (as Bp. Middlet. has proved) the exposition of the one is negatived by the presence of the Art. $\tau \delta \nu$, that of the other, both by the Art. and by an unprecedented involution of construction. It is evident that $\tau \delta \nu \mu \delta \nu_{0} \nu d \lambda$. $\boldsymbol{\theta}$. is in apposstion with $\sigma \epsilon$. But may we, with Lampe, suppose tiv to mean 'who art the? 1 think not; for this testimony of Christ with respect to the Deity would be here out of place. It is most agreeable to the nature of the Art. (on which see Middlet. G. A. Chap. ii.) to take the $\tau \delta \nu$ to mean 'as being.' This mistake as to the force of the Art. seems to have led Lampe into the error (for such it is) of rendering the кal $8 v \dot{d \pi}$. 'I. X. 'and Jesus, whom thou hast sent, to be the Christ; which, by separating 'I nooūv and X Pıन्गोy, does violence to the construction. The above error with respect to the article seems also to have had no little weight with some Commentators, as





Wets. and Tittm., who, resting on this force of dlet., who take $\mu$ óvo $d \lambda_{\eta} \theta_{L} \nu \partial \nu$ as meant in the Article, and on a sense of which the words $\mu$ óvoy and $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta$. are capable, think that Christ here recognizes in God the Father a kind of superiority, being such principaliter, and кaт dFoxiv, as the Fountain of all Deity, the Origin of human salvation, \&c. \&c. See the extracts from Wets. and Tittm. in Recens. Synop. As to the doctrine itself, it has been held by many eminent and orthodox Theologians antient and modern. See the citations from the Fathers and from Zanch., Wendelin, Calvin, and Bp. Bull, cited from Wets. in Recens. Synop. That long list, however, will only prove that those Theologians held the doctrine, not that they certainly recognized it in the present passage. Theologians must not be judged as 1nterpreters. Thus Calvin, as I have been assured by one of the profoundest Theologians of this country (the venerable Bishop of Salisbury), has in his Commentary expounded a multitude of important texts (even those which are connected with his system) in a very different sense to that in which he had taken them in his Institutes. This would be, we may suppose, not merely because the one was the work of early youth, the other of maturity of years and ripeness of judgment ; but because in the one case he acted merely as a Theologian, in the other as an Interpreter. But to retura, it is quite certain, that the direct revelation of this mysterious doctrine here (and, be it remembered, it is elseuhere only to be inferred) would be out of place. And indeed one of the arguments which moet effectually keep out the Socinian interpretation will go far to exclude this. To its supporters would, in some measure, apply what Bp . Middlet. has said of the Socinian interpreters, who (he observes) " argue as if in our Saviour's days there had been the same controversy about the nature and essence of the One True God, which arose afterwards; whereas the dispute then was, whether there were a plurality of Gods, or only One; the Jews held the latter opinion, and the whole Pagan world the former." What interpretation, then, are we to adopt ? Lampe, who has an immense mass of valuable matter on this text, comes to the decision, that we are to suppose Jesus here considers the Father singly, in that relation, " quam per consilium pacis ad eum accepit." This, he thinks, is clear from the present occasion, and the scope of the whole prayer considered. He then goes on to remark: " Pa trem, contradistinctè ad Filium, non tam propter essentiam, quam propter Economiam divinam observari ut Deum, quin ut Deum Filii dictum ad Cap. i. 1." This he thinks very suitable to the present occasion. He holds too, that there is no opposition here intended between the Father and the Son. Jesus no more says that the Father is the true God to the exclusion of the Son, than does Isaiah xliv. 6. \& xiv. 22." The above interpretation may be the true one; but I prefer that of the most eminent antient and some considerable modern Commentators, as Brug., Maldon., Grot., Whitby, Kuin., and Mp. Mid-
opposition to the idols and false Gods of the heathens, which have no real entity. Comp. 1 Thess. i. 9. 1 Joh. ii. 8. v. 20. Apoc. iii. 7. J. A. H. Tittmann de Synon. N.T. p. 155. comparing the difference between $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta \dot{j}$ s and $\alpha \lambda_{\eta}-$ $\theta \iota \nu d s$, observes " $\alpha \lambda \eta \theta \omega \dot{s}$ est, qui non tantùm nomen habet et speciem, sed rerum naturam et indolem, que nomini conveniat." Our Lord, then, may be supposed to have so spoken, in order that the Apostles might learn, and teach others, to use the words of Bp. Middlet., "that eternal life is to be obtained only by a knowledge of the One true God, and of Jesus Christ; thus directing the mind to the truths both of natural and revealed Religion." The learned Prelate, however, has failed to perceive the full force of $\gamma^{\iota \nu} \dot{0} \sigma \kappa \infty 0 t_{\text {, }}$ which is ably traced by Lampe and Tittm. in Recens. Synop. It must denote such a knowing and recognixing the Father and the Son to be what they have revealed themselves cum effectu, as shall influence us to worship, serve, and obey Them, and seek salvation from Them.
4. $\sigma \in$ Énó $\xi_{\alpha \sigma a}$ ] Jesus glorified the Father by causing Him and his attributes to be known and acknowledged on earth. See more in Lampe and Tittm.

- Td Ejov-rootiow] Not the work of teaching only, as some Commentators suppose, but also (as Grot., Lampe, and Storr have proved) the work of atonement by his death and passion, which was then commencing. For as they were so very near, this anticipation is very admissible. The words breathe a holy joy and triumph at such a work being well nigh completed.

5. $\delta o \xi_{\alpha} \sigma \delta \dot{\nu} \nu \mu, \sigma \dot{v} \& c$.] Here again our Lord has predicted of himself things most august, and worthy of the deepest attention, as tending to illustrate his Divine majesty. 1. He professes that he had סó $\xi a \nu$, (Hebr. 7II) the divine majesty, embracing the whole compass of the Divine nature, attributes, counsels, and works. (See the Note on i. 14.) 2. He makes this asseveration, 'I had glory mapa ool, i.e. with God in Heaven.' Therefore he uas in Heaven before he came into the world, or was in the bosom of the Father. ( 1 Joh. i. 18.) 3. He professes that he had glory with the Father, before he came to the earth; nay
 or beginning of the world," or (as the Apostles
 expresses it) $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \bar{v}$, i. e. from eternity. For by phrases of that sort the Hebrews were accustomed to designate eternity. (See the Note oni.1.) 4. He prays that the glory and majesty which, as Son of God, he enjoyed from all eternity, the Father would now invest him with, as Son of man, and Saviour of the human race. Now, how could he have said this, and thus prayed for it from the Father, unless he had been the true and eternal Son of God, such as he is described in this Gospel ? (Tittm.) The same learned Commentator and Lampe have completely refuted the


 inntive. 25.



 30. infr.
6. $\sigma \alpha^{\prime} \dot{e} \sigma \tau!, ~ к а i ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \sigma \dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \mu a ́ \cdot$


Socinian perversion of exciv, by which it is understood only of destination.
6. From this to v. 14. Christ speaks of his disciples, and commends them to the especial favour and protection of the Father, since they had been his docile and attached disciples, and were to be the first plantens of his Gospel.

- ìvopa тoù $\boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \overline{0}$ ] As this is often used for $\theta \epsilon d s$, so oou rd $\begin{gathered}\text { ö } \\ \nu o \mu a \\ \text { may denote Thee, i. e. thy }\end{gathered}$ nature, attributes, and counsels for the salvation of men. See $\mathbf{v}$. 14. Oüs déöwкd́s $\mu$ ои. The best Commentators are agreed, that the sense is: ' whom by Thy Providence Thou hast delivered to me, taught, and brought unto salvation.' By roù кóomou is meant the world at large, which, as we are elsewhere told, lieth in sin.
- $\sigma o l \tilde{\eta} \sigma a \nu$ ] Most recent Commentators (as Kuin. and Tittm.) take this to mean, 'they were thy sincere and faithful worshippers.' But that sense seems far-fetched, and can only be admitted as a secondury sense. Lampe has truly observed, that the phrase is used of right of property. Not to refine, or split this (as Lampe does) into too many parts, they might be said to be God's, 1. by right of creation; 2. by the Sinaitical covenant; 3. by approbation, as sincere and well affected, and by separation from the world by Divine Grace. $\Delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\boldsymbol{\sigma}}$ кás, hast given
 be understood partly of the word of Grace by which they were brought to embrace the Gospel of Christ, but chiefly of the doctrine of the Gospel delivered to Christ by God the Father. Ter. is a very strong term, and imports entire acquiescence in, and adherence to as a principle of action.

7. érvooкav] ' they assuredly know.' By xd $\nu$ ra must be understood the words and works enjoined by the Father; but chiefly the former, as appears from the next verse, which is, in some measure, exegetical of the preceding.
 that we must be careful to distinguish the procoedings of Jesus from God, xvi. 28. and his coming to the earth, v.3., and his being sent by God, as the Messiah. See vi. 69.
8. ò $\pi \in \rho l ~ \tau o u ̈ ~ \kappa \dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu o u ~ \& \rho \omega о \tau \bar{\omega}]$ As Christ did elnewhere pray for the world, nay for his very enemies, Kuin. supposes the sense to be: II pray for thy faithful worshippers; they are worthy of this favour.' Others, taking oi- $d \lambda \lambda a$ for won ramequam, resort to a contortion of the wurds still less to be commended, as if the vorld wrepe praved for in a different sense to the Apostles.
dering, not ' I pray,' but 'I am praying,' i.e. 1 am now praying. The nature of the thing did not (as the best Commentators have seen) admit of Christ's then praying for the world, i.e. the unbelieving part of it, those who had not embraced the Gospel. See v. 20. Under axy point of view, the passage gives no countenance to the doctrines of Calvinism.

- örı бoí ciaı] See Note on v. 6. नol ìaay.

10. каl $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \alpha-\dot{\beta} \mu \dot{\alpha}]$ These words ane, I conceive, meant to suggest another reason why they were the Father's, namely, by adoption, since from the close communion of will, counsel, and works, of Father and Son, whatever is the one's, is also the other's. See xvi. 15. Hence the disciples are sometimes called the Father's, and sometimes the Son's. The márтa mary be taken (as the recent Commentators direct) for the masc. wàytas; but in a gnome generalis like this, the neuter may denote both persons and things.
 seem meant to suggest something beyond the $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\alpha}, ~ q . d$. 'they are not only mine, but I am glorified in them; therefore they are effectively mine.' Rosenm. and Tittm. take deoós. in a future sense, as a preterite prophetic. But the glorification in question, namely, by the propagation of His religion, had already taken place. and was taking place. Grot. and Doddr. would take it for a Pres. or Aor. But strict philological propriety will not warrant that. The case seems to be this. The Perf. very often is put for the Pres., when an action or state is designated, which has commenced in time past, but extends also to the present. See Matth. Gr. Gr. \$503. and Win. Gr. Gr. §34. 3. a. But the Present, in an action of continued progression, like the spreading of the Gospel, is so intermingled with the Future, that the Future may also be included. Thus the full sense is : 'I have been, am being, and am to be glorified.' ' By aivois, 'by means of them,' 'through their instrumentality.'
 the reason why Jesus commends them to the protection of God. See xiv. 18. Render; 'I am [as it were] no longer in the world; but they are in the world [alone], while 1 am gone to thee.' The Commentators have failed to perceive that something is wanting to complete the sense. It should seem that in this verse the
 peated, q. d. - Yea, I do pray for them, as being myself no longer in the world \&c.' In eipi








and épxomat there is not a mere enallage, as most Commentators suppose; but the Present is here, as Lampe observes, " pro Futuro constanti, quod tanquam pressens jam considerari incipit.'

- жá rep äyıe \&c.] Now follows, to the end of the Chapter, the prayer of our Lord for the disciples. With the rárep alyce the Commentators compare the use of Sancte Pater! in the Latin Classical writers. But that was often not precatory.
 sense of $\frac{1 \nu}{} \tau \hat{0}$ óvó $\mu$. gov the Commentators are not quite agreed. Grot., De Dieu, Kuin., and Campo. take it to mean 'in thy worship,' the profession of thy doctrine, in the faith and practice of thy religion. "By making known (says Campo.) the name of God to those who enjoyed the old dispensation, is plainly suggested that additional light was conveyed to them, which they could not have derived from it. By manifeasting God's name to them, therefore, we must understand the communication of those truths which peculiarly characterize the new dispenseion; and as every revelation which God gives tends further to illustrate the divine character, the instructions which our Lord gave to his dis: ciples, relating to life and immortality, and the recovery of sinners through his mediation, may well be called revealing God, or (which, in the Hebrew idiom, is the same) the name of God to them." Lampe understands by $\dot{\boldsymbol{j}}$. the attributes and perfections of the Deity; and Tittm., the counsels and plans of the father for the salvation of men by His Son. Of these interpretations the former cannot be admitted; the latter may be included in the first mentioned one.

There is here a remarkable var. lect. For our very many MSS. (mostly antient) and several Greek Commentaries and early Esd. have $\dot{\omega}$, which has been received by almost every Editor from Beng. and Wets, to Scholz. And this is very agreeable to the Critical Canon which directs the more difficult reading to be preferred. But that canon has several limitations and exceptions; and amongst the rest, where the readings are exceedingly similar in appearance, and where the propriety of the language rejects the more difficult one, or where the context will not permit it. Now all these have place here. For the $\dot{\psi}$ involves an unprecedented harshness, since thus we must (as the Greek Commentators do) take $\dot{\delta} \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \dot{\bar{p}} \delta \nu \rho \mu$. in the sense 'by thy power;' a use of $\dot{j} \nu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ no where else found in Scripture, or any other writings, and which would not be suitable to the words following. Besides, the idiom of $\dot{\omega}$ for $\ddot{\ddot{c}}$ is not agreeable to the character of St. John's style, and no where occurs in hisGos-
gel or his Epistles. Whereas the above use occurs at v.6,9 and 12. of this prayer. Indeed the common reading seems to be placed beyond doubt by the repetition of the words in the next
 ours déowкás $\mu$ or. I cannot help suspecting that the false interpretation of $\delta \nu o ́ \mu$. and the alteration of out to $\Phi$ or on, which last is found in several MSS. and Versions, arose chiefly from an inattention to the transposition; which, however, is frequent in St. John's writings. Besides, it must be remembered that the number of MSS. which have the common reading is very far superior to that of those which have the new reading. Among those, too, are some very antent ones, ss the Cod. Cantal.; and they are confirmed by several of the earliest Versions and Fathers. Whereas the testimony of Versions and Commentators for the new reading is very slender. Certainly, if the librarii did stumble at $\dot{\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{o} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{r}}$ (and what was so probable?) they would be likely to alter the reading oüs to $\ddot{0}$ or $\psi^{\circ}$. Whereas if we were to suppose $\tilde{\omega}$, or $\tilde{o}$, to have been the original reading, it would not be easy to account for the alteration into oüs.
 ing of two phrases, 'tva $\omega^{\sigma} \sigma_{t}$ ( kat') 'tv, and lvi
 plaining the former. Both import an intimate union and agreement in will, sentiment, profession, and purpose.
12. $\alpha \pi \infty \lambda \in \tau 0]$ There seems here to be, as in Ps. ii. 12., an allusion to the case or a traveller who has, from abandoning his guide, lost the right path and come to destruction. In the

 use of the antecedent for the consequent, as in the present passage.

- $\dot{o}$ vide $\boldsymbol{T i j s}$ axaleias] The sense is not merely, as Rosenm., Kuin., Schleusn., and Tittm. render, homo nequam, nullius frugis; but the expression must mean one who is deserving of and devoted to perdition. This use of vide with a noun in the Genit. is a Hebraism, like that of 12.
- Iva $\dot{\eta}$ रрифŋ̀ $\left.\pi \lambda_{\eta \rho \omega} \theta \bar{y}\right]$ i.e. not fortuitously, but by the rise counsel of God, that the perfidy of one wretched man should profit to the salvation of the human race. The Commentators, however, take the sense to be: So that the Scriptare is thus fulfilled, i.e. the words of Scripture may be applied in this case. On the passage here had in view the commentators are not agreed. Most think there is only a general reference to the prophecies concerning the passion of our Saviour.

13. iva exwot-aúrois] Render: ' that they











may by those [words] have their joy in me (i. e. of which I am the object) complete and perfect.' Now that would shortly be the case at his resurrection, and the sending to them the Holy Spirit.
14. où d $\rho \omega=\omega \bar{\omega}-$ кóquoo] The sense seems to be, ' I pray not that thou shouldst remove them from this life.' Some suppose here a figurative use of $\kappa \dot{o} \sigma \mu o s$. But that is not to be thought of. To more fully comprehend the purport of the expression, it is proper to bear in mind a remark of Grot. (for which, however, the learned Commentator was indebted to Euthym.) that " these words are said in explication of the preceding, and for the sake of the disciples then present, and within hearing." The same will apply to many other passages of this prayer, which might otherwise seem incongraous. Our Lord, therefore, meant indirectly to warn his disciples, under the bitter persecutions they would be called upon to endure, not to wish or pray for death, since he had important purposes for them to answer during many years: at the same time suggesting to them motives for constancy and fortitude, in their being defended and preserved under the sorrows which surrounded them.

By тoü rovn¢où many eminent Commentators antient and modern understand the Evil one ; and they refer to Matth. vi. 13. \& 1 Joh. v. 19. But though that interpretation be there suitable, it does not follow that it should here be admitted, since the circumstances are different. It is better, with Est., Grot., Lampe, Campl., Noesselt, Rosenm., and Tittm., to take roü roynpoù in the neuter gender, as Rom. xii. 9. and often elsewhere. The sense, too, thence arising (which is not so much moral as physical evil, i.e. calamity from trials and persecutions) is more extensive and more suitable to the context.
17. ajiavov- $\alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \theta$ eld dori] From their preservation under trials and calamity our Lord proceeds to pray for their preservation in the Evangelical office. 'Ayu'Yeuv, like the Heb. wTP, signifies properly to separate, set apart to some office, whether civil, or Ecclesiastical, i. e. to consecrate to the worship of God, or the concerns of religion. "Aycos denotes a person so set apart, or consecrated, and is used especially of Prophets, or Priests, both being said áyáyer$\theta a$. The word is also used of the appointment by the Father of the Son to the work of human salvation by his incarnation, (see x. 36.) and to
which our Lord is said to have devoted himself. Thus Tittm. thinks that the sense is: 'Set them apart unto thy truth,' i.e. cause them to dedicate and set themselves apart to their Evangelical office. This, however, is diluting the meaning. which, I conceive, is: 'Sanctify them (namely, by the Holy Spirit) unto the promulgation of Thy truth,' i. e. the Gospel ; a rendering required by the allusion which, I think, is discernible in dyto the Holy Spirit, the great and all-efficacions Agent in this matter. And surely the Apostles. though already separated from the ungodly and unbelieving world, required to be especially pa rified and consecrated to their momentous office by the first fruits of the Holy Spirit. Of this use of $\dot{\nu} \nu$ with a Dative, for an Accus. with cis, there are numerous examples in the N.T.
Some Editors cancel the oov. But the sense cannot dispense with it. There is no necessity. however, with some, to render ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda r^{\prime} \theta$ cta $j u s t$ after 'the truth,' or 'that truth.' The full sense is ' truth itself.' The clause is, I conceive, exe-
 the Gospel. The whole passage is well paraphrased by Mede: "Separate them unto the Ministry of the Truth, the word of thy Gospel, which is the truth and verification of the promises of God."
18. els $\tau \dot{\partial} \nu$ кóouov] Namely, for the purpose mentioned in the foregoing verse, to promulgate thy Truth.
 cent Commentators take $\alpha \gamma$. to, mean ' 1 set myself apart and devote myself;' (See Recens; Synop.) others, ' I offer myself up as a victim.' But there is no occasion to take the word in any other sense than at v. 17. where see
 be taken as $\alpha \gamma$. $\bar{\delta} \tau \bar{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$. at v.17. And so Chrys.
20. Now follows the last part of this Prayer, which is offered up in behalf of all believers. The sense is: ' Neither, however, do I pray for these alone, (my Disciples) but for those also, who, by their instruction, shall become believers in me, and embrace my religion.'

For wiotevaóvrion, tıovevóntwy, which is found in almost all the best MSS., Versions, and Fathers, 'and in the early Edd., is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. It is plain from the var. lect. and the Greek Commentators that the former is a gloss.












 кảy $\omega$ év aúzoís. 38.
Marc. 14.

1


 at v.22. denote complete and perfect union and concord. And the purport of the prayer is, that all believers may be united to each other and to God by a union such as subsists betiveen the Father and the Son, i.e. close, intimate, and efficacious, in affection, will, and work. Union of doctrine, on which Kuin. injudiciously lays the chief stress, may be implied: but that is all.

- Zva ó кóapos-dréoreinas] The sense is: - That the [hitherto unbelieving part of the] world may [seeing this perfect unity and concord and mutual love] believe in my Divine mission. Since a religion so promotive of peace and happiness will be thought likely to have come from God.

22. Triv סó $\mathfrak{\xi} \alpha v$ ท̂u-autois] It is strange that co many Commentators should take dókay to denote the porcer of sorking miracles; since it is plain from v. 24. that it denotes the glory and happiness laid up for the righteous in heaven; especially as the subject of this portion of Christ's Prayer is not the Apostles, but all C'hristians of all ages. (Kuin.) $\Delta \dot{o} \xi a \nu$ is aptly employed, because the happiness is, we are told, such as it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive. This glory is, of course, not to be the
 The same view is taken by most recent Interpreters. But it is strained, and is liable to Philological exception. The Perf. is, indeed, sometimes taken for the Fut.; but that, I apprehend, is never the case when the action is very distant. Besides, it would be not a little harsh to take סédooka as a Future, when סédocos immediately before must be taken as a Perfect. That sense,
 in the next verse. Nor indeed are we compelled to suppose that the subject of this and the next verse is the same with that at vv. 20 and 21. , because these latter may be parenthetical. And the $\delta$ detookas makes it highly probable that in vv. 21 and 22. Christ again reverts to the Apostles. By the sógav may be meant such a part of His mediatorial glory, imparted to them by the Holy Spirit, as was suitable to the purposes
they were to accomplish ; including, of course, the working of miracles in establishment of the truth of the Gospel.

The next words express the chief purpose of the glory imparted by the Holy Spirit ; namely, that there may be that perfect union which subsists between the Father and the Son. This is first denoted, as before, by lya wiviv in ca0cis ijueis èv $\in \sigma \mu e \nu$, and then by the still stronger ex-
 somewhat anomalous, must, as the best Commentators are agreed, signify, 'that they may be perfectly united.'
24. ois déḋळкás mot $\theta e ̀ \lambda<\infty \quad \& c$.] Kuin. and Tittm., agreeably to their view of the two preceding vv., are obliged to refer this to the Apostles. But throughout this Gospel the expression oüs dédcoxás $\mu$ oi is constantly referred to Christians of every age. $\theta$ é $\lambda m$ only imports an earnest request or desire. On the words lva drou-mou Kuin. and Tittm. refine too much, especially by taking $\theta c \omega \rho \bar{\omega} \sigma$ in a metaphorical sense. The words simply denote admission to Heaven, as spectators of the glory of Christ ; which implies by that an union or participation in this felicity.
25. This and v. 26 , as appear from the ouros (used deuktıкios), must be referred to the Apostles, at least primarily ; though it may, by accommodation, be applied to Christians of every age. Our Lord finally commends them to the care and protection of the Father. $\Delta$ iкale, ' most benignant.' "Eyporav, 'have known, are assured.' "Oroua, thy counsels \&c. Гעшрíco. i. e. both in person after my resurrection, and by the Paraclete.
 which thou hast loved me may be in them, (i.e. enjoyed by them, that they may be worthy of thy love and assistance, and attain happiness both in this world and in the next) and that I may be in them, i.e. that they may remain united with me in the same holy cause, of promoting the salvation of men.
XVIII. 1. The Evangelist now proceeds to record the Paxsion of our Lord, and has pursued
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such a plan in the narration, as to only touch lightly on what had been recorded by preceding writers; at the same time adding certain circumstances omitted by them ; thus strongly confirming the truth of what had been before written, and, in the circumstances which he himself records, plainly supposing it. (Lampe.)

1. Toù Kédoosy] The reading is here uncertain. For the vulg. taì Kédocov, four of the most antient MSS., and several of the most antient
 which was preferred by Beza, Casaub., Cam., Cast., Drus., Lightf., Bois, Bynæus, Reland, and most other learned Commentators down to Middlet., Kuin., and Tittm., and has been received by Beng., Griesb., Knapp, Vat., and Scholz. The common reading is strenuously, but not successfully, defended by Lampe and Matthei, the former of whom was little acquainted with Criticism; and the critical skill of the latter is sometimes neutralized by his prejudices. Notwithstanding that he magisterially pronounces toù Kєठिक्ण to be an error of the scribes, I cannot help thinking, with the celebrated persons first mentioned, that the common reading is such. The evidence for the other reading may, indeed, seem slender; but it is, in fact, of the most weighty kind, (confirmed also by Josephus), the MSS. being some of the most antient in existence, and the Versions most estimable. Matthri indeed adduces the authority of Chrys., Cyrill, Theophyl., and Euthym., for the common reading. But the authority of Commentators and Homily-uriters, in proper names which they do not particularly treat on, is but small, especially where the common reading is retained. That $\tau \hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ Kédocon occurs twice in the LXX. may seem a weighty confirmation of the Vulg. But that would not be decisive; and possibly when the varr. lectt. in Holmes's Edition be examined, qoü K $\quad \dot{\rho} \rho \boldsymbol{\rho} \dot{\nu}$ may turn out to be the true reading. The common reading might, as Middlet. observes, originate in a mistake of the Copyists; (thousands of similar mutations occurring in the Classical writers) or even design, since the Greeks were accustomed to Grecize barbarous names. And it would seem probable that the name meant "the brook of Cedars." It is, however, by Lightf. and Reland well derived from the Hebr. רדp; and hence paill denote the black torrent. Middlet. instances a similar corruption in Suid. of Xet $\mu$ -
 torrent of ivy-trees."
 garden ground provided with a sort of cottage.
2. tij $\sigma \pi \in i \rho a \nu]$ This word is, I think, derived from orseo cognate with oricim, to drase or hoist, and signifies a band. Hence it would designate any military corps; but the best founded opinion, and that supported by all the most eminent Commentators, is that it here designates either the Roman cohort which garrisoned the castle of Antonia, or the detachment of it, which, by order of the Procurator, attended on the Sanhedrim at the great festivals, and kept the peace. Hence the propriety of the Artich, to denote the detachment then on duty.

- $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha}$ фауळу каl $\lambda a \mu \pi$. 1 It is not easy to determine the precise force of these two terms. Bynæus thinks the former meant torches; the latter, lamps. Lampe observes, that the latter commonly denoted torches; as appears from the
 Fer. L. v. The same Commentator, on an inspection of Athen. L. xv. 18. where he treats of фavol, is of opinion, that the фavol were a more antient and rude kind of torches, formed of split laths bound into a bundle; but that afterwards torches of other materials, and of a more convenient manufacture (namely, tapers and lanterns) came into use ; though the others still continued in use among the meaner sort of people. That both lanterns and torches were in use among soldiers, appears from Dionys. Hal. ix. (cited by

 It was, indeed, (I would add) usual for such corps to carry both arms and lanterns. So Thucyd. iii. 23 . speaking of the picket guard of the Peloponnesians ( 300 in number) says sad iv
 बंठаs è Хоутєs.
 some accounted a Hebraism. But, as Kypke and Wets. have shown, it is also found in the Classical writers. It signifies to brfall, and is almost always used of what is coil. 'E' $\varepsilon \in \lambda \in$ ajo. This is rightly taken by Euthym., Mold., and
 the garden whither Christ had retired for prayer.
 the recent Commentators here adopt different views. The former suppose a miracle; the lat-
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ter, with the exception of Tittm., recognize none, attributing the circumstance to their awe at the sight of so wonderful and extraordinary a person ; of this they adduce what they parallel from the Classical writers. The cases, however, are not parallel, but quite of another kind, and the mode in which those Commentators (as, for instance, Kosenm. and Ruin.) account for the thing, proceeds almost wholly upon supposition. If we confine ourselves simply to the plain words, and the actual circumstances, we shall see that something far surpassing the ordinary, and rising to the preternatural, is suggested. See the able Notes of Wolf, Lampe, and Tittm. There seems to be no reason to doubt, but that some undefinable, but supernatural, power was exercased, as in many similar instances recorded in Holy writ ; as that of Paul, (Acts xxii.) where he is described as being 'struck to the earth' as well as struck with blindness. Though whether that amounts to what is, strictly speaking, a miracle, may be doubted. For all those cases in Scripture where any of the senses of men, as sight and hearing, are so affected as to be for the time suspended, (as in the case of the men of Sodom at Lot's door. See Gen. xix. 11., and the persons sent to apprehend Elijah. See Joseph. Ant. ix. 4,3.), seem not to amount to the miraculous, though they reach the preternatural. Whether all fell to the ground, (even Judas) as the old Commentators maintain, is uncertain, and will by no means alter the case. But we cannot understand less than very many. To suppose, with some recent Commentators, that only two or three did, is such a trifling with the plain words of Scripture as would not be allowed for a moment to a Barrister in a court of justice, while pleading upon the meanest affair of common life.

8. el oũv d $\mu \mathrm{d}$-ixdyecv] A brief manner of speaking, of which the sense may be thus expressed by paraphrase : ' If then ye seek to apprebend me [take me; but] let those [my companions] depart.'
9. Ira $\pi \lambda_{\eta \rho \omega} \theta_{\eta} \& x c$.] The best Commentators are agreed that the sense is, ' Thus was made good, or verified, the words, \&c.' See the excellent Note of Tittm. in Recens. Synop., by which all the difficulties that have been by some raised on this passage, entirely vanish.
10. row] This is omitted in very many of the lest MSS., Versions, and the Ed. Prince., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Beng. and Wets. to Scholz; and with reason, for internal evidence is as much against it as external.

- $\tau \boldsymbol{d}$ тotripıon-avitó; ] Sec Notes on Matt. $x x .20 . x x v i .39 \& 54$. The interrogation involves a strong negation, (so Euthym. well explains adivu Mèv out), and the whole is expresgive of perfect acquiescence in the will of His Father.
12,13. Of the discrepancy which has been supposed to exist in this statement as compared with those of the other Evangelists, see the able solution of Tittm. in Recens. Synop. On the dissimilarity of mattes in St. John as compared with the other Evangelists, yet coupled with a similitude of manner, Ir. Paley has well treated, and especially with reference to the present passage.

15. sal d \& $\lambda$ 入 os $\mu a 0$ gris] There is no little difficulty here to account for the Article. Many eminent Commentators are inclined to think it redundant. But Bp. Niddl. justly accounts this device " the refuge of learned ignorance." He admits the difficulty; but rightly maintains, that, " though we should not be able to ascertain it, it is better to impute the obscurity to our own want of knowledge, than to attempt to subvert the analogy of language. Thus we should leave the proof of the fitness to more fortunate inquiry." To cancel, with Erasm., Beng., and Vat., is rash. because the evidence for its omission is so very slight, only that of four MSS., and that of Yersion but slender; indeed such are scarcely evidence at all in cases of this nature. And it is far easier to account for the omission than the


















addition of the Article．We must therefore explain as we may．Now almost all Commen－ tators，antient and modern，are agreed that by the other disciple the Evangelist means himself； and with reason；for though Grot．，Lampe， Heum．，and Pearce deny this，they are as un－ successful in proving it not to have been St． John，as they are fixing on any other disciple． See a full discussion of the matter in Recens． Synop．The Evangelist never mentions himself by nume，and yet（as Michaelis shows）he has described the whole of what took place in the hall of Annas，\＆ic．so circumstantially that we cannot but conclude that he was present，as Ecclesiastical tradition attests．＂Supposing， then，（remarks Bp．Middl．）that St．John him－ self is meant by $\dot{\dot{o}} \dot{d} \lambda \lambda o s \mu a \theta \eta \tau i{ }^{2}$ ，it may not be impossible to assign something like a plausible reason why he should call himself the other disciple．＂＂This phrase（contrary to the learned Prelate）obviously implies the remaining one of turo persons，who not only were，in common with many others，disciples of Christ，but between whom some still closer relation might be recog－ nized to exist：and if it could be shown that Peter and John stood towards each other in any such relation，the term the other disciple might not unfitly be used，immediately after the men－ tion of Peter，to designate John；especially if， from any cause whatever，John was not to be spoken of by name．Now it does appear that a particular and even exclusive friendship existed between Peter and John．The same expression ${ }_{\delta}$ d $\lambda \lambda$ os $\mu \alpha \theta$ ．occurs in Joh．$\times x .2,3,4,8$ ，from which it may be inferred，that this phrase，when accompanied with the mention of Peter，was readily，in the earliest period of Christianity，un－ derstood to signify John．＂
 meant o show how it happened that persons of
such inferior rank as he and St．Peter should have obtained access to the Hall of the High Priest．

18．$\alpha^{2} \nu$ Өakuai $]$ The word denotes a mass of live charcoal，（so Suid．d⿱日өракиd тефирактю－

 whence duөpoos，forid，red，burning．So Hom． 11．$\gamma$ ． 213. d $\nu$ Opaкinv $\sigma$ тopícas．The difference is plain from an adage of Suidas：$\mu \dot{\eta}$ тiv т́́фраи
 exactly paralleled by a weil－known adage of our own language．
－廿úxos $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\nu} \nu$ ］The sense is：＇It was［then］ cold weather．＇
20．$\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu$ тотє］This signifies＂in all places and at all times and opportunities．＂The $\tau \bar{\eta}$ ia iv $\tau \bar{p}$ ouvay．is omitted in a great number of the best MSS．，and is cancelled by almost all Editors from Beng．and Matheri to Scholz ；and rightly，I conceive；for internal evidence is strong against it；since it would be more likely to be
 than wrongly omitted．And，moreover；when the singular is，as here，used in a generic sense for the plural at large，it rejects the Article．
 fore of＇Ioudaiot，almost all the MSS．，with all the Edd．up to Beza＇s，have жávrote，which is received by almost every Editor from Wets．to Scholz；and rightly；since the external evi－ dence for $\pi a \nu \tau 0 \theta \in \nu$ is slender，and its internal far inferior to the other．Hdxtore may include xdytotev，but not vice versa．
 best Commentators have seen，must be taken comparatè，and with restriction，i．e．nothing post sindonem，like the Heathen mysteries，or Tewish Cabbala，at variance with any public doctrines，and consequently nothing savouring of sedition．
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25-27. Peter, it seems, was exceedingly terrified, especially on beholding such a scene, and hearing Jesus examined respecting his disciples : from whence he might infer that the Sanhedrim had thoughts of ordering them also to be seized. He did not, it appears, return to himself before the cock crew, of which our Lord had spoken ; when (as we learn from Lu. xxii. 61.) Jesus turned his eyes towards him, and looked him steadfastly in the face. Our Lord, by the common decree of the Sanhedrim, had been pronounced worthy of death, since he had professed himself to be the Messiah and the Son of God. In order to carry this sentence into effect, they brought the affair before Pontus Pilate. The council, therefore, rose, and just as the day was dawning, led him bound, as one pronounced worthy of death, to the Pratorium. Mathew,
 Пı入áт@; whence it is evident that it was their counsel and plan that Pilate should order him to execution. For mapadoùvat signifies to deliver any one into the hands of another, for punishment. Thus do these infatuated wretches hurry away the Messiah sent to them, and deliver him up to the Gentiles! But, it may be asked, why should the Jewish Rulers have delivered Jesus to the Roman Procurator for punishment, and not themselves have executed it ; and by what right could Pilate condemn him to death? On this question the most learned are divided in opinion; some contending that the right of inflitting punishment hard been taken away from the Jews: others, that they still retained that right. The disagreement seems to be best settled
by those who maintain that a distinction must be made between sacred and civil causes, and that in those pertaining to religion the Jews had at that time the power of inflicting capital punishment, [subject, however, to the confirmation of the Procurator.-Fdit.] but in civil causes and crimes, including sedition, tumult, and such as appertained to the crimen lase majestatis or treason, that was not conceded to them, the cognizance of all these matters resting solely with the President or Procurator. Now our Lord's cause, at the beginning, did not seem to be civil, at least the Jewish Rulers had pronounced him worthy of death because he had professed himself the Messiah and the Son of God; and yet they led him to Pontus Pilate in order that they might cast on him the blame of shedding innocent blood. Afterwards, however, when Pilate had declared that he found no fault in him, and seemed to wish to remove from himself the cognizance of the cause, they ventured (as we learn from Lu. xxiii. 2.) to bring forward a tuo-fold political charge, namely, that of exciting the populace to rebellion, and of discountenancing the payment of tribute; offences both of them falling within Pilate's jurisdiction, as being

31. $\lambda d \beta$ ere airdv $\dot{\text { u }}$ cis] Take ye him and punish him, q.d., I cannot do a thing so unheard of in the Roman law as to condemn a person unheard. On jimiv oùk ëerrtiv, \&c. see Note on v. 25-27.
32. 7 ya $\dot{\dot{o}}$ 入ó jos \&c.] The best Commentators are agreed that the sense is: 'This was made good the words,' \&rc. Sec Note infra v. 9.


















 own knowledge or opinion of my having been concerned in seditious practices.
 words Kuin. determines the sense to be as follows: 'No, I have not asked thee of my own thought: I have found nothing hitherto in thee which would afford any colour to such a charge as thine enemies advance: but it does not hence follow that thou art innocent. Of thee and thy case I know nothing. I am not a Jew, to care about such things. It is on the representations of thy countrymen and the Priests that l examine thee. What hast thou done to afford ground for this criminal accusation ?'
36. $\dot{\eta}$ $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda$ cia \&c.] The sense is: ' I am a King, it is true, but my kingdom is not a temporal one, but entirely spiritual. If my kingdom had been of this world, I should have collected about me vast numbers of my countrymen. These would have defended me against the attacks of my Jewish adversaries. But as I have done nothing of this sort, it is plain that my kingdom is not of such a nature as at all interferes with earthly governments, or affords any colour for this charge of sedition.' (Tittm.)
37. oùкoūv $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon u ̀ s$ eI av́;] Some Commentators would have the interrogation removed. But that is an unjustifiable weakening of the sense. Besides, there is no good authority for oúkoūv coming first in a sentence not interrogative.

- oì $\lambda$ é ${ }^{\prime}$ es \&s.] i.e. thou truly sayest that I am a King; it is very true; I am a King. Eì $\lambda e ́ \gamma \epsilon c s$ signifies it is so; a phrase of modest assent, concession, and affirmation. Our Lord now proceeds to show the nature of his kingdom
and in what sense he is a King. He is come not to reign, but to bear witness to the truth, to promote, confirm, and establish it.
 of the truth, i. e. the truth of the Gospel, true religion. So Rom. ii. 8. í ék tive dpedefas. 'Acoves, 'hearkeneth to.'

38. $\tau i \dot{i} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu d \lambda \eta^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \iota a ;$ On the exact force of this question Commentators are not agreed. Some take the meaning to be: 'What is truth to me ? what care I about truth ?' But this sense cannot be elicited from the words. Equally objectionable is that of so altering the punctuation as to force some sense out of the words, which they do not naturally yield. It is best to embrace certain portions of the interpretations both of antient and recent Commentators (see Recens. Synop.) and suppose, that Pilate put the question with no design of insulting our Lord, but that, knowing the endless disputations of the Philosophers on this subject, and how difficult it was to arrive at any clear notions on the subject, he asked, 'What is truth ? define it,' not this truth which you recommend and teach, as some render; for that would require the Article. No doubt, had lie received an answer to the former question, he would have propounded the latter. But our Lord, knowing that the question was put with levity and insincerity, vouchsafed no answer. Nor did Pilate think it worth his while to wait long for the solution of so debated a question from a Jewish peasant. And perceiving that the kingdom claimed by him to be purely figurative, and something similar to what the Heathen Philosophers spoke of, and considering him a harmless sort of person, he only thought how he might set him at liberty.
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XIX. 4,5. On the motives and intent with which Pilate brought out Jesus, \&c. see my Note in Recons. Synop.
39. $\sigma$ ávipwov, oraúpwoov」 In very many MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Fed., is added aúrdv, which is received by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz. But it is so difficult to account for its omission in far more than half of the MSS., many of them very antient, and so easy to account for its insertion, that I dare not follow their example. Such kind of exclamations are usually very elliptical, and the pronoun I have observed to be often omitted. Out of very many examples which 1 could adduce the following must suffice. Pseudo Furip. Res. 685. Main, taif. Aristoph. sæpisime.

- גáßere aúvov impels \&c.] Many understand these words as a permission. But Pilate neither said, nor could say this seriously; for he well knew that crucifixion was not in use among the Jews; and the Priests had already declared, that they could not put him to death, on account of the festival. The words (as Chrysost. long ago saw, and in which light they have been viewed by some modern Commentators, as Lamps) are those of irritation and disgust: neither does it appear that the Jews regarded them as a permission, since they immediately resort to a new charge, that of blasphemy. (Ruin.)

7. ทце is עómov ex $\chi o \mu \in \nu, \& c$.] The sense is: - By our law he has been found guilty of blasphemy and condemned : but on account of the feast we could not inflict the punishment; and therefore we had recourse to thee.' By the law they meant some passages of the O.T., as Levit. xxiv. 16. Deut. xiii. 1. sq. v. 18 \& 20 . which denounce death on pretenders to Divine mission. And éxoingev here means pretended to be. On the full purport of the Jewish Law on this head, on the criterion of false prophets, and on the kind of death inflicted on such, see the Note of Lamp in Recens. Synop.

The $\tau o \bar{u}$ before $\Theta c o u$ is omitted in many MSS. and early Ld., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz; a decision approved of by Bp. Hid., who shows that vide Өcoû may mean the Son of God as well as $\dot{o}$ vide tout $\Theta \in o \bar{v}$, and proves that Christ, in affirming that he was the Son of God, did, in fact, affirm his Messiahship. See Note on Matt. xiv. 33. and comp. Lu. xxii. 66. with v. 70. Tittm., how ever, (whose Note see in Recens. Synop.) is of opinion that the names Messiah and Son of God were by no means synonymous, but of very different meaning ; the former expressing office. the latter Divine nature. See i. 14. And that Pilate so understand the appellation, he thinks is clear from what follows. Be that as it may, the two appellations by which the Consolation of Israel was called, namely, Messiah (which implied, they thought, Kingship) and Son of God, (which expressed His Divine nature and union with God) afforded the chief Priests an opporunity of shifting the charge as they found politic, urging either that of sedition, or of blasphemy.
8. $\mu \bar{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ ' $\left.\dot{\phi} \circ \beta \dot{\eta} \theta_{\eta}\right]$ Namely, to condemn him to be crucified. On the nature of this fear (which the Commentators ascribe to various causes) it were vain to speculate. It arose probally from an impression such as Pilate could not fail to have, that Jesus was at least a very extraordinary person, if not the character he claimed to be. Whether this idea was at all mixed up with the notion of a Heathen Demigod, (though the most celebrated Commentators ascribe it chiefly to that) is doubtful. The stories of Demigods, \&c. were probably by the higher classes regarded in nearly the same light in which we view them, namely, as mere Mythological fictions, only deserving of attention from their antiquity and poetic elegance.
9. xó日єע el $\sigma$; ; This cannot mean, as some eminent Commentators imagine, 'of what country art thou ?' for Pilate knew him to be a Calilean; but, as others interpret, 'What is your















origin and parentage ？＇So 2 Sam．i．13．ró0ev el $\sigma \dot{\text { i }}$ ；Josh．ix．8．т $\dot{\theta} \theta \in \boldsymbol{\nu}$ є̈ $\sigma \tau \epsilon$ ．It should seem that Pilate already knew that Jesus claimed to be of celestial origin．To this question our Lord was pleased to make no answer，partly because Pilate＇s conduct did not entitle him to any，and partly because an answer to the interrogation， in the usual acceptation of the words，Pilate could scarcely need；and in any other sense it would have been little intelligible，and have led to further questions，all superfluous，since Jesus knew he would deliver him to the fury of the Jews．

11．oúk elXes－ävw日ev］The best Commenta－ tors，antient and modern，are，of opinion that ducotev signifies＇from on high，＇＇from Heaven，＇ ＇from Divine Providence，＇as in iii．31．James i． 17．and Elian and Dio Chrys．cited by the Commentators．For equoviay êxecty the more Classical phrase is кúpios eimi．So in a kindred passage of Dio Cass．p．398．1．кúpıos каl бwiana cal deo入úбal tıvas．By dedonévoy，Grot．rightly understands，not that common permission，which leaves many things to the natural course of events，but something decreed in the Divine counsels．
－$\delta \iota \dot{\alpha}$ тоüto］With these words the Com－ mentators are perplexed．To suppose，with Kuin．，a mere formula of transition，is very un－ satisfactory．The methods proposed by Markl． and Bp．Pearce are too violent and arbitrary． Grot．takes the $\delta \boldsymbol{j}$ ci toūto to refer to something suppressed．But he is very unsuccessful in divining what．It may perhaps be best regarded as a highly elliptical expression，and the oca toüto need not be too rigorously interpreted． The sense seems to be，＇Wherefore in thus giving me up to the fury of the people］he who put me into thy hands is more in fault than thou．＇ The suppression of the words included in brackets may be attributed to delicacy．

12．This divining of the thoughts，and this candid judgment of his conduct，seems to have much affected Pilate for the moment ；hence he made another effort to save Jesus．The Jewr．
however，perceiving that Pilate was stadying every method of releasing Jesus，and that he paid little attention to their second charge，of blasphemy，as not falling under his cognizance． now return to their first alleged crime，which especially belonged to the Procurator，namely， that of sedition，and treason against Carsar．
－oúr el фíरos $\tau$ ．K．］A popular meiosis． ＇Auridézer is，by a Hellenistic use，put for dzei日eî or dyтaípet．The threat was powerful， since，as we learn from Suetonius and Tacitus， Casar was most suspicious，and punished with death any offence that bordered on the crimen lasse majestatis．

13．ik $\left.\alpha^{\alpha} \theta_{\iota} \sigma \in \nu\right]$ A juridical expression signify－ ing sut for judgment．Aı日óorporov denoted a pavement formed of pieces of marble and stone of various colours，such as were called nermiex－ lata，and tesselata．A sort of luxury which had arisen in the time of Sylla，and had extended even to the most remote provinces．Julius Casar，as we learn from Sueton．Vit．46．，car－ ried about with him in his expeditions such pieces of sawn marble and variegated stone with which to adorn his pretorium．

14．тарабкеuท̀ той та́б $\chi \alpha$ ］See Campb．
－wipa de $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \in l$ ©̈KTV］On the seeming dis－ crepancy between this account and that of the other Evangelists，see Recens．Synop．and the Note on Mark xv．25．There can be no doubt that an error of number has crept in，the $\Gamma$ be－ ing confounded with the 5 ，and that the true reading is $\Gamma$ ，i．e．rpitn．Indeed，this read－ ing is found in seven of the best MSS．，some Fathers，as Fuseb．（who says it was so written in the autograph）Jerome，Severus，Ammonius， and Theophyl．，and some Scholiasts，with Non－ nus．In this opinion the best recent Commen－ tators acquiesce．That this clause is not，as Wassenbergh maintained，a gloss is triumphantly established by Bornm．de Glossis，p． 44.

15．oúx äxopev \＆cc．］A mere pretence，since the Jews always maintained that they owed no allegiance to any earthly monarch，but were subjects of God only．
 iva $\sigma \tau a v p \omega \theta \bar{\eta}$.
terce 16.
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16. кal बжírayoy] Many MSS. and early Edd., and some Fathers and Commentators have गुyayov, which is received by almost every
 not aycuv, is a vox sol. de hac re. The error, I suspect, arose from the contraction $\kappa \dot{d} \pi \dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{y}^{2} y_{o v,}$ which might easily be mistaken for cal ทr yov.
19. '0nke] 'caused it to be put;' by a very frequent idiom.
22. ì ү́́үрафа, रé $\rho \rho a \phi a]$ i. e. as it is written, it shall stand. A popular form of expressing a refusal to have it altered.
 mentators are of opinion that the sense is: "Thus was fulfilled the Scripture (i.e. Ps. xxii. 19.) which saith.' But they are not agreed whether this verse of the Psalm was meant to refer to Christ, or not. Most recent Interpreters adopt the latter view, and take them to relate solely to David, and to have reference to the rebellion of Absalom. They are here only, they think, introduced by application and accommodation to
the present purpose. But though it be true that the form iva $\pi \lambda_{\eta \rho} \omega 0 \hat{\eta}$ í $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{j}$ sometimes means, that such a thing so happened that this or that passage would appear quite suitable to it; yet as this and other passages of the Psalms cannot be proved to have been fulfilled in the case of Darid, whereas, this and other parts of the same Psalm were minutely fulfilled in that of Christ ; and, what is more, as the Evangelist plainly regarded the Psalm as prophetical, and the words as fulfilled in Christ, the former view is decidedly preferable, and it is extremely probable (as Dr. Doddr. observes) that "in this Scripture and some others, the mind of the Prophet was thrown into a preternatural ecstasy, in which, on some secret intimation given to him that he therein personated the Messiah, he wrote expressly what the Spirit dictated, without any particular regard to himself."

25-27. The incident narrated in these verses is recorded by St. John only. On Clopas, see Recens. Synop.
26. LBov̀ $\dot{\delta}$ viós oov] i. e. regard him as thy
 22.















son, and just after iठov̀ $\dot{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \dot{\tau} \eta \rho$ $\sigma o v$, 'regard her as thy mother.' Thus commending the two persons whom he most dearly loved one to the care and affection of the other.
28. clows-ötı та́vтa $\ddot{0} \eta$ тeт.] On the in-
 30. Commentators are not agreed. Many eminent modern ones take the expression to be a popular one, for, 'It is all over with me,' 'I am about to breathe my last.' And they cite from
 passages less to the purpose. That, however, is a sense too feeble to be admitted. The true interpretation is doubtless that of the antients and early moderns, 'knowing that all things [namely, what he had to do and to suffer] were now accomplished.'
 mentators think that the passage of the Psalm here alluded to, lxix. 22., was not meant of the Messiah, and consequently not prophetical; but that St. John only applies it to Christ by accommodation. But that tool of accommodation is not very safe in the hands of some who maintain this view, and here it must by no means be employed. It is plain that the Evangelist did not mean merely to accommodate the passage, but to show that it was prophetic of Christ, and now fulfilled, at least in its principal scope. As to the argument, that the imprecations at v. 23. show the Psalm not to be prophetical, it is one of straw. For it is not necessary to suppose the uhole Psalm prophetic of Christ. See Note supra v. 24., and the admirable new Translation by Dr. French and Mr.Skinner, with their excellent notes.
 connected with iofowites see Note on Matth. xxvii. 50. Suffice it here to say, that there are several species of the hyssop, one of which, and, no doubt, the one here meant, has a woody reedlike stalk, of two feet or more in length, and which is mentioned by the Rabbinical writers as bound up in bundles for firing. Y $\sigma \sigma \omega^{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \varphi$, then,

by Matthew and Mark кала́мш; ;) and this, if of the length above mentioned, might eavily enable a person to reach the mouth of Jesus on the cross, which was by no means high. Iept$\theta$ évees signifies 'having wound or fastened it around,' or, 'sticking it on.' Thus the word is used in the LXX. to express the Hebr. Tw, to tie to, in Prov. vii. 3. And Aristoph. Theom. 387. uses $\pi \in \rho \dot{i} \theta$ ou for $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \theta o v$.
30. жарє́ठшкє $\tau \dot{\delta} \pi \nu \in \bar{v} \mu a]$ This and the $\alpha \phi \bar{\eta} \kappa \varepsilon$ то туейма of Mathew suggest the idea of a placid, peaceful, and resigned dissolution, and were therefore used by the pious among the Hebrews to denote that the soul is rendered back unto God its original author, to dispose of according to his good pleasure. (Grot. and Kuin.)
 Friday.

- ueq. 门i $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \dot{\rho} \rho a]$ A very solemn festival, namely, as being not only a Sabbath, but that day of the Passover week on which the people assembled in the Temple to offer the sheaf of first fruits. For Excivou very many MSS., Versions, and early Edd. have ekeliv, which is received by most Editors from Wets. to Scholz.
 as some imagine, to increase their torment, bui to accelerate death, as is plain from the passages of the Classical writers cited by West. The legs, we learn, were broken just above the ancle by an iron mallet.
 opinion exists as to the intent of the Evangelist in this attestation, and still more as to the exact sense conveyed by the coming forth of the blood and water. It has been almost universally supposed that the Evangelist meant to establish the fact of our Lord's actual death; though some think by the ai $\mu$ a кal iobop is indicated either the water found in the pericardium, or, what is more probable, the uqueous and sanguinems liquid in the cavities of the plenra after a mortal stab, and which sometimes flows together with












the blood；for that the presence of water mixed with blood following a stab，shows that the pericardium was pierced，and consequently that death has ensued，or must very shortly supervene． Dr．Burton，however，thinks that for the real death of Christ there is much stronger evidence than this：and，considering the earnestness with which the Evangelist speaks in the next verse， he is of opinion that it was his intent to refute an absurd notion of the Docetz，that Christ had not a natural body．And this view Dr．B．con－ firms from Irenæus，Origen，and Athanasius． Nor is it by any means improbable；and the support from antiquity with which he has en－ circled it，is entitled to much attention．Yet I cannot consent to give up the former interpre－ tation．which is too strongly countenanced by
 May not，however，the Evangelist have had both the above objects in view？the latter as con－ twined in the former．

The Epitaph of this soldier（if genuine）said to be found in the church of St．Alary at Lyons in France，is as follows：＂Oui Saleatoris latus in Truce cuspide frit，Longinus hic jacet．＂＇

35．каl с́шракшіц－1 $\mu а \rho т и \rho i a] ~ 1$ would rem－ der，＇And one who was an eye－witness［to the circumstance］testifieth to the truth of this，and his testimony is true；yea he is conscious that he speaks，the truth，so that ye may rely on his testimony．
 conceive，to a clause omitted，q．d．＇And believe ye well may－for all these things were really，＇ $\star c$ ．
－óoroün oi \＆c．］The recent Commentators in general are of opinion that the passages of the O．T．（Exod．xii．46．and Numb．ix．12．）in which it is enjoined that not a bone of the lamb shall be broken，are not prophetical，and had no reference to Christ．＂There are（say they）no vestiges in the O．T．of the Paschal lamb being considered as a type of Christ：nor did the Evangelist mean to so represent it．He only applies the passage to our Lord，and compares Christ with the Paschal lamb；intending to de－ note，that in the institution of the Paschal lamb， something had been enjoined similar to what would，by Divine interposition，take place in the case of Christ，by which Providence，there－： fore，it happened that his bones were not broken．＂

But that the Evangelist did mean so to represent， and consequently that such must be the only true view，no person who fairly considers the words can doubt．The words certainly do indi－ cate，that the things in question were brought about by the counsels of Divine Providence， through whose interposition this Scripture was fulfilled．What can offer so probable a reason for the otherwise unaccountable injunction，that not a bone of the Paschal lamb should be broken， as that it might point to the sacrifice of that lamb as a type of the sacrifice of Christ？
37．ofoural \＆c．］lt has been convincingly proved by Lampe and Titus，that this passage is prophetic of the piercing of Christ＇s side．By they are meant，as he slows，the unbelieving Jews．There is no doubt that the passage is also alluded to by St．John in Revel．i．7．Titty． refers this to the advent of our Lord to take vengeance on the Jews at the destruction of Jerusalem．But it surely refers to the final advent at the day of judgment．
39．$\sigma \mu \dot{v} \rho \eta \eta s$ sal d入óns］The $\sigma \mu \dot{\rho} \rho \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ here mentioned is，as we learn from Dioscorides and Pliny，the juice of a certain tree in Arabia，from which，on the trunk being bored，exudes a kind of gummy liquid，which is caught on mats，\＆c． The d $\lambda$ on is supposed by many Commentators not to be the herb aloes，from which a bitter juice is expressed，but an aromatic tree，which is also called agallochum，and the hylaloe，whose wood was likewise employed by the Egyptians for embalming corpses．The myrrh is supposed to have been brought dry and bruised，and the hylaloe wood bruised and pulverized．The body could not have been regularly embalmed，for which there was not time sufficient；but spices and unguents were brought to wash and anoint the body．
－nigel 入itpas eixatóv］For mice several good MSS．and early Eld．have wis，which is received by Griesb．and others down to Scholz； but without reason；for it is far easier to con－ ceive will changed into is by the scribes，than wis altered to wi gel by the librarii．The quantity here mentioned has been thought by some too great；and they propose some other signification of 入irpa．But there is no reason to abandon the common interpretation；for the chamber in which our Lord＇s body was deposited would， according to the common custom，have to be
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completely perfumed; and no inconsiderable part might be reserved for the funeral ; since, on such occasions, immense quantities of spices were burnt, especially when great reverence was meant to be shown.
40. evtaф.] The term signifies to prepare for burial in any manner whatever. See Campb. in Recens. Synop.
41. $\mu \nu \eta \mu \in \overline{i o y} d \tau \epsilon ่ \theta \eta$ ] See Tittm. in Recens. Synop.
42. ठıณ тท̀v тарабкєuij \& \& .] Since the day (Friday) was verging to a close, and the Sabbath was at hand, they laid Jesus in the sepulchre near at hand, that they might observe the Sabbatical rest.
XX. On the harmony of the Resurrection see Notes on Matt. xxviii. 1-10. and Townsend.
2. $\tau \delta \nu$ d $\lambda \lambda o \nu \mu a \theta$.] See Note on $x$ viii. 15.
4. троé $\rho \rho a \mu$ т тáXıov] Here is a blending of two forms of expression, to strengthen the sense.
 fear of the pollution supposed to be imparted by a dead body; or through timidity.

ticip. has a signif. pregn., 'rolled up and put.'
 xoopis.
8. $\dot{e \pi}$ iorevociv] Not, the truth of the resurrection, as some eminent Commentators explain. (for, as the words following suggest, they did not yet know or fully comprehend the prophecies which predicted his resurrection) but, as most of the best Commentators are agreed, the fact related by Mary, that the body had been removed from the sepulchre.
10. Tpos caurous] The sense is: 'to themselves,' i.e. their companions, who then jointly with them occupied the same house. So that it comes to mean ' to their homes,' of which sense many examples are adduced by the Commentators.
12. dv 入eukois] Sub. inarioss, of which ellipsis the Commentators cite several examples. The same occurs in other words denoting colour, as
 serves Lampe) has ever been a symbol, 1. of ercellence, whether of person or office: 2 . of holiness and innocence.

















15. $\dot{\text { o }}$ aทroupós.] This is explained by the best Commentators 'the bailiff.' But there is no reason why it may not denote the occupier of the plot of garden. Kópic. The term is here, as often, merely an appellation of common civility to a person of respectable appearance.
-el $\sigma \dot{\text { ex }}$ ejdoraбas a.] i.. e. 'if thou hast been concerned in its removal.' Mary, it seems, thought the corpse had been removed by some friend, with the knowledge and connivance, if not assistance, of the gardener: and she would be anxious to know where. This seems to be ex-
 and I will remove him [for burial.]
17. $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\sim}$ address, and consequently the exact sense of «̈тTov, Commentators differ; yet the most aminent ones are agreed that the meaning of the whole passage is: ' Let me go, do not waste the time in embracing my feet, or in other marks of reverence and affection: you will have an opportunity of showing this respect afterwards; for 1 am not immediately going to take my departure from earth : but go directly to my brethren with this comforting message, that in a little time I shall ascend to heaven, to God my Father, who is now your Father and your Good.' This sense of arтeotat (neglected by the Commentators) I have in Recens. Synop. illustrated from Eurip. Phon. 910. $\mu \dot{\text { in 'minapßávov. where the Schol. }}$ explains $\mu \dot{\eta}$ нои äжтоv.

What was the action of Mary interrupted by Christ's words, has been matter of debate among Commentators. Some say embracing; others, more probably, clasping the knees or feet, as expressing deep veneration and perhaps adoration. Some Commentators think Mary's motive in wishing to embrace our Lord was to ascertain whether it was He corporeally, or only a Spirit. That may have been one of the motives.

In the words following, dvaßé $\beta \eta \kappa \alpha$ is regarded by the best Commentators as a Terf. Pres., 'I am not [immediately] going to ascend' \&rc. q.d.
'I shall remain a short time longer on earth.' With respect to the words of the message, diva$\beta$ ain $\pi \rho \delta_{s}-i \mu \omega \dot{\nu}$, the sense there is: ' I am [shortly] going to ascend to my Father' \&c. This, together with what was said to Mary, would inform them that He should stay a short time with them upon earth, and then ascend-He does not say to heaven, but, in order to remind them of the relation in which He stands to God, and they to Him , he says "to my Father" which would give them to understand that, for their comfort, He who was from the beginning with God is going to act as their Mediator with God, who would now become their Father and their God, not by creation only, but by the spiritual paeternity implied in the Gospel covenant.
 i. e. and told; for the Partic. may be resolved into a verb and copula.
 trent and the recent modern Commentators are at the antipodes of opinion; the former maintraining that Jesus penetrated, by a miracle, through the closed doors ; the latter, that he entered in the ordinary way, after knocking and being admitted. The former view cannot well be admitted, 1 . because it involves an insuperable Philosophical difficulty, well stated by Whitey, and ably treated by Lampe; 2. Because such a sense cannot be proved to exist in the words. Still less, however, is the latter opinion defensidle; for no dispassionate person can attentively peruse this passage and the similar one at $\mathbf{v} .26$. without feeling that something far more than that is meant. In the latter passage there would have been no need of the $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ Өиршй кек $\lambda$., unless something more had been intended, something supernatural. (See also v. 30.) But what, it may be asked! Not the first-mentioned circumstance, for the reasons above adduced; but (as there is a beautiful oeconomy, like that observed in Nature, in our Lord's working of miracles, by which no more power is employed than is necessary to E. F








 on 'I nбoûs. ধ̈̀єє










accomplish the purpose in view) we may suppose, with the lest Commentators, from Calvin, (Grot., and Whitby down to Titty., that our Lord caused the doors to preternaturally open of themselves ; as the angel did. Acts v. 19 . compared with 23 . See also Acts xii. $4,6,7 \& 10$. I must not omit to olmerve that those who adopt the second interpretation are compelled to make the
 " at door-shutting time.", But for that there is III authority; nor could it be so taken here, since II is closely connected with the following öxou Virus \&c. Besides, when at v. 30. the Evangelist mays "And many other miracles did Jesus before his disciples" \&c., must he not have alluded to the two preternatural methods of entrance, which tarpeia were indeed most seasonable to revive their fainting faith, and excite them to " trust in (cod."
19. es cry] Here and at v. 26. \& xxi. 4. $\epsilon \sigma \tau \eta$ is put by a signify. pres., for ' came and stood,' or, un a Classical writer would have expressed it,

 vent for many purposes which could have no parallel with the sending of the Apostles, the antlwis-kal must solely refer to those points which were similar, i. e. the being delegated and n..n!ulinsioned by the Father as His ambassadors, in lilly the message of salvation to the world. A in l lin Apostles were empowered to hand down In. il mulhority to their successors. Thus the I In infin Religion is of Divine ordinance.
دJ dirvinayre| This we are, with the best
 H "thill wi. luis was pleased to introduce and

al roy can only be understood as a present promise of a future benefit, which should very shortly be communicated, namely, on the day of Pentecost.
23. ai $\tau \tau \nu \omega \nu \& c$.] These words were meant primarily for the Apostles; but they contain a promise which, with due limitation, may be extended to their successors. For the privilege given was one of office; and as the office was handed down, there is no reason why the privilege should not remain. The best Commentators are agreed that $\dot{d} \phi \tilde{\eta} \tau \epsilon$ and $\kappa \rho a \tau j \tau \epsilon$ must be taken declarelively, i.e. to pronounce the remission or retenton of sins; which is the general and safest view of the sense: though the more eminent of the recent Commentators ( even Titty.) are of opinion that the sense is, "that they were authorized to declare that pardon of sins and salvation in general will be granted to all who seek it by the appointed means." But compare Matt. xvi. 18 \& 19. where see Note.
 he have the testimony of both sight and touch as to the identity and real bodily presence of Jesus." For Thomas did not so much call in question the veracity of the disciples, as he supposed they had been deceived by some spirit. Bá入a-Tüzoy may be rendered 'put my finger upon the print.'
26. $\dot{e} \sigma(\omega)$ 'within doors.' This and the opposit form er $\xi_{\infty}$ elva occur only in the LXX. and later writers.
27. äxเo os] 'faithless.' This uctive sense is rare in the Classical writers ; yet it sometimes there occurs. See my Note on Thucyd. i. 68. The use of words for miotevicu is yet more rare; but one or two examples are adduced by the Commentators.
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1 XXI. META taûza éфavépwóv éavtò̀ $\pi \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \iota \nu \dot{o}$

28. $\dot{\boldsymbol{o}} \mathrm{K} \dot{\prime} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ toss- $-\mu o v]$ On the sense of these remarkable words there has never been any real doubt, except such as has been raised by Arian and socinians, who, to avoid this plain recognation of the Divinity of our Lord, have been compelled to resort to the miserable shift of aking the words as a mere formula of admiration, as we say Good Lord! \&c., an idiom found also in cher modern languages, but of which not a vestige is found in the antient ones. Besides, that sense is not permitted by the words following, in which Christ commends the faith of Thomas, though he gently reproves the tardiness with which it was yielded. And, what is more, the words being introduced by an $\epsilon i \pi e \nu$ ai tu shows they cannot be a mere exclamation of surprise, but an address, which, to use the words of Bp . Middlet.) though in the form of an exclamation, amounts to a confession of faith, and was equivalent to a direct assertion of our Saviour's Divinity.
A question, however, still remains as to the construction. Many eminent Commentators, as Grot., Wets., Rosenm., Ruin., Titty., and Niddilet., think that the Kúptos and $\boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \dot{\boldsymbol{c}}$ are rocatitires, and that the Article stands for the Classical $\dot{\varphi}$. Others, as the ancient Syriac and Persic Translators, and some modern Commenttors from Bp. Pearson downwards, take them as Nominatives, with the ellipsis of fou ci. The former method seems to involve the least difficulty.
In vain is it attempted to evade the force of this recognition by assigning a lower sense to $\theta \epsilon$ es ; for a refutation of which, and an illustration of the sense in which the Apostles understand it, see Note in Recess. Synop. and Middy. in log. The testimony is clear, and the authority irrefragable ; for by not censuring the Appsties for now first applying the name God to Him, our Lord takes it to Himself, thinking it (in the words of the Apostle) "not robbery to be equal with God."
29. $\left.\theta_{w} \mu \bar{a}\right]$ This is omitted in very many MSS. and early EdS., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz.
30. $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon \bar{a}]$ By न $\eta \mu \epsilon \bar{i} a$ the earlier Commentators understood the miracles worked by Christ $;$ but the recent ones in general the arguments and proofs of his resurrection ; a sense of the word perhaps found at ii. 18. And this view is supported by Chrysost. and Euthym. But as the sentence is introduced with $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu$ oi, and is a
conclusion drawn from the whole of the preceding Gospel, the $a \eta \mu \epsilon i \bar{u}$ would seem to mean profs of his Messiahship; and there seems to be a reference to the acknoorledgment of it just made by Thomas; for $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { eriorevias must there include }\end{gathered}$ faith in that Messiahship, as consequent on the resurrection of Jesus. This interpretation is strongly confirmed by the next verse ; nor is it destitute of authority ; for Lampe has shown at large that $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i a$ must here refer to "omnia quecunque evita sunk a Domino per totem vita decursum.". Rut were not all these so many proofs of his Messiahship?
Of course, तoteiv is here put for סoüvae or тарехєе.
XX1. Respecting the authority of this Chapter some doubt has been raised by Grot., $\mathrm{L}_{0}$ Clerc., and Heumann. But it will clearly appear, from the matter introduced in Recess. Synop. from Lampe, Kin., and Tittm., that the opinion is as destitute of all internal proof as it is of external authority. Granting the Chapter to be (as they say) an Appendix to the foregoing accounts, might not (as Tittm. suggests) the Evangelist have had good reason to ald something to his own work, as St. Paul did to certain of his Epistles, especially that to the Roomans? As to the objection, that the circumstances recorded are not of sufficient consequence, that has lite or no force; indeed it were prosumptuous to sit in judgment on the words of inspiration: and such they must be supposed to be, since not the slightest external evidence has been adduced to invalidate their authority. "As to some peculiarities in this portion of Scripture, we are (as Titter. suggests) to bear in mind (what is evident from the other Evangelists as well as St. John) that our Lord, after his resurrection, no longer held intercourse with his Disciples in the way he had done before his death, nor treated them with the same familiarity; nay, that he carried himself as one already withdrawn from human society, and soon to depart, to enter upon his majesty and glory, at the right hand of the Father; which was done, in order, perhaps, that they might be gradually weaned from his visible presence, which they had hitherto enjoyed, and become accustomed to his invisible presence."

1. naval i.e. those events recorded in the preceding Chapter. 'Enl, for map with the Dative.

$$
\text { E. F. } 2
$$






















2．ท̄rav $\delta \mu o u ̄]$ i．e．temporarily，at the period in question．Of this signification examples are adduced by Kypke．＂A入入oi éк ті̄̀ $\mu a \theta \eta \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ ． Whether these were Apostles，or of the number of the Seventy Disciples，or of Christ＇s followers in general，cannot be determined．It does not， however，follow that because the Evangelist does not mention their names，they were not of the number of the Apostles．
3．$\dot{u} \pi d \gamma \omega$ in $\lambda$ civet $]$ This use of the Present found here in $\dot{\psi \pi}$ ．and just after in ${ }^{\ell} \rho \times \chi^{\dot{\rho}} \mu \in \theta a$ ， followed by an Infin．of action，denoting intention of presently doing a thing，seems to be taken from the popular phraseology；though something like it is found in the later Classical writers．
－evéß ${ }^{2} \sigma a \nu$ ］This（for the common reading dives．）is found in the best MSS．and earliest Id．，and has been received by almost every Editor from Wets．to Scholz；rightly；for dea－ naivest，in a context like the present，cannot be admitted．The words of Mark vi． 51 ．may be thought to defend it；but that passage is of a different kind．
 nerally the most favourable time for fishing．
5．सaidia］Marion and тeкviov were terms of kindness or affability used by elderly persons or superiors．IIpootdyiov．The word properly denotes what is eaten with bread，as we say meat， though（like $\delta \psi(\dot{d} \rho(0 \nu)$ it is generally used of fish．This word is only found in the later writers． From Chrys．and Wets．it appears that $\tau i$ ． Xe ere was a phrase employed by those who inquired of fishers or hunters what they had taken．
6．$\beta$ á入ete cis $\tau \dot{a}$ ．$\delta e \xi$ ta $\mu e ́ p \eta]$ An Imperative of advice，proceeding，as they imagined，from one who had some knowledge of their art． （Euthym．and Lamps．）Eupforere is employed
by an ellipsis common to hunters and fishers in all languages．＇A ${ }^{\prime} \delta$ ，for ind，prat；a sense usually considered Hebraic，but found also in the Classical writers，especially Thucyd．
7．＇ 0 кúpoos é aril＇They inferred this from the prodigious draught，and the remembrance of the similar one mentioned at Lu．v．l．
－ET $\pi \in \nu \delta \dot{U} \tau \eta \nu$ ．From the researches of Salmas．． Lampe，and Fischer，this somewhat obscure word is proved to mean that upper linen tunic worn by Greeks，Romans，and Jews，and called by the Romans superaria，corresponding to our coat， and worn between the inner tunic（the interula， subucula of the Romans，and the（ircivioxos or izoò́ sins of the Greeks）and the surtout，or upper garment，cloak．The best description is that of Euthym．in Recess．Synop．，from which it seems to have been a common fisherman＇s coat，consisting of a sort of full frock without sleeves，to prevent incumbrance in swimming， reaching only to the knees，and bound round the middle by a belt．The Article has here the force of the pronoun possessive．And oteYciaato has a significatio pragnans for put on and girded． $\Gamma \nu \mu \nu d s$, i．e．not absolutely so，but stripped to his shirt and waistcoat．T $\bar{\omega} \pi \lambda$ staple signifies ＇by the fishing boat．＇
 which is expressed at $\mathbf{v}$ ． 11 ．This idiom in nouns of capacity is found in all languages，chiefly， however，in the popular phraseology．How we are to understand $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu-\sigma 6 \rho o \nu \tau e r$ is well ex－ planned by Dr．A．Clarke．§úpecy differs from e $\lambda$ set as our drag from draw ；and implies greater force used to overcome resistance．
 standing the sophistry of some recent Commen－ taters，who seek to account for this in the natural
 11 'Еує́
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way, there is no doubt, from the air of the passage, but that the fire and food were not only provided by Christ, but that miraculously, as he had just before caused the miraculous draught of fishes. Both miracles may have been intended to teach, by symbolical actions, the lesson, that Jesus had both the will and the power to abundantly provide for the comfortable subsistence of his disciples.
At ápтov sub. кeipenov, from the preceding. - $\mathbf{O} \boldsymbol{\psi}$ of prov. Almost all our Translators render this fish, as if there were many. But that sense is not well established, and the usage both of the Scriptural and Classical writers shows that it rather denotes $a$ fish. And as all seem to have made a meal of it, it was, no doubt, large, like the fish in the net, which being first called bu va$\rho^{i} \omega \nu$, are then said to have been of great size. In this sense, indeed, the word often occurs in the Classical writers, as Ashen. and Elian. Hence there is no excusing Wakefield and $\mathbf{A}$. Clarke for rendering 'a small fish.' Even had not the context shown that a large fish is meant, Mr. Wakefield at least could not have to learn that in Greek (as in other languages) diminutive forms often lose their diminutive sense, (so $\beta_{t}$ $\beta \lambda i o \nu$ \&c.) as patronymics their patronymic sense. See my Note on Thucyd. i. 1. We may observe that the fish being not only numerous, but all large, made the miracle the more conspicuous.
11. érxiconn] Not broken, as in E. V.; still less torn, as Waked. renders, for that is exaggerating the sense: (a fault, however, of which that Critic is rarely guilty) but, as Camp. translates, rent.
12. dipıoriocare] The Commentators and Critics are not agreed whether this should be understood of dinner, or breakfast. It is a matter of no easy determination, but of little consequince. Most recent Commentators adopt the latter interpretation; but Campb. in a long and able Note maintains the former. If we could be sure that the antients used (as he asserts) but two meals for our three, (breakfast, dinner, and
supper) and that the latter corresponded to our supper, he would be right. But I have on Thucyd. iv. 91. proved that, though, in the early times, but tue meals were taken, aptotov and jeinvov, yet afterwards even in the time of Thucyd. there were three, the $\dot{\alpha} \kappa \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \sigma \mu a$ answering to our breakfast ; the ápiaroy, to our lunch, or early dinner, and the deixvov or late dinner, or supper. If the same custom prevailed in Judæa, then aploroy will denote the second meal, call it by what name we may. If, however, the Jews, as is not improbable, retained the primitive custom of two meals a day, then dotorov will here mean, as it did in the time of Homer, breakfast, and denote (as its etymon would suggest) a far more substantial meal than the $\alpha \kappa \rho \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \mu \mu \alpha$, which seems to have meant a snack, caught up by those who could not wait till the aptorov, which was taken about an hour before noon.
14. тpícov] i. e. the third time recorded in this Gospel; for it appears from Matth. xxviii. 16. sq. that he had appeared to them five times before.
15. тлeion тoútcov;] By the тoúton Whitby, Peace, Middl., and others understand these nets, boats, and other implements of his trade; q. d. 'dost thou prefer my service to any lemporal occupation ?' But there is something frigid. in this sense. Besides, as Jortin observes, Petermight love Jesus more than these, and yet not love him much. The true interpretation seems to be that of the antients and many of the most eminent moderns, who assign the following sense : ' Dost thou lave me more than those do?' The question has (as Campo. remarks) a reference to the declaration of Peter, Math. xxvi. 33., when he seemed to arrogate a superiority above the rest, in zeal for his master and steadiness in his service. See more in Camps. and Titty. ap. Recens. Synop. It is proper to observe, that though our Lord asks the question thrice, yet the admonition which each time follows it up is not quite the same: for $\beta$ oorxety signifies to fred, provide with pasture ; тоздаivetv, to tend; thus

















Christ is the $\dot{\boldsymbol{o}} \pi \boldsymbol{\pi o i} \mu \eta \nu$. 'A psia signifies lints; тоовата, sheep of mature age; the former here denoting the less advanced, the latter the more ripened Christian professors.
17. $\sigma \dot{\iota}$ тávra oidas A recognition of omaniscience, and consequently Divinity.
18. On the connexion of this with the preceding, Commentators needlessly perplex themselves; since it has, I apprehend, no other connexion than this, that the matter which now follows was suggested by the foregoing circumstances. With respect to the sense of this portion, the common interpretation, espoused by the antient and almost all modern Commentators, except the recent ones, seems to be alone the true one, and is as perspicuous as can be expected from any thing predictory, and not to be
 and жeptenáтers ö́mou $\dot{\eta} \theta \in \lambda$ es are a figurative mode of expression, to signify the perfect freedom of action and activity of youth and strength. The former refers to work or travel, which to the long-vested natives of the East requires the girding up of the garments, as indeed it did also to the Greeks and Romans. See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 97. 4. There is too (as Lampe has proved) an allusion to the custom at Rome, by which those about to be crucified had their necks put into a yoke, and their hands stretched out and fastened to the ends of the yoke, and, after having been thus led through the city, were carried out to be crucified.

Neшंтєpos the Translators all render young. It may be more exactly rendered by our old word " younker which was no doubt derived from the comparative younger.

For ot oct a Classical writer would have said $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \xi \varepsilon \iota$. And indeed some MSS. have $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\alpha} \xi=v a r$, or $a \xi$ guat ; both evidently glosses. From the question put by Peter at $\mathbf{v}$. 21. it is manifest that he understood his Lord's expressions of a violent death by the executioner; but what kind of death, he could not understand.
19. òogá $\sigma \in t$ tod $\nu \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \dot{o} \nu$ ] A magnificent title of martyrdom, on which see Grot. and Titus. in Recess. Synop.

- גंко入oú der $\mu$ ot] Some Commentators antent and modern take this in the physical sense - follow me, i. e. come this way,' Others, however, adopt the figurative sense, follow my example even unto the cross :' which, by a comprison of this with v . 22., where the admonition is repeated, is shewn to be the true one.

20. \&ंगt $\sigma \tau \rho a \phi \varepsilon / s$ ] It seems that Peter, though he was aware of the figurative sense, yet thought it safe to observe the direction in the literal one. and therefore follows his master. Then, turning about and seeing John also following, and thereby showing his comprehension of the meaning of Jesus, he feels a curiosity to know whether John. his friend and companion, would also accompany him in death, and therefore asks out cos $8 \in \boldsymbol{j l}$, where must be supplied monet, which may mean, 'What shall he do, suffer, (for mot $\omega$ has often the sense of $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \omega)$ i. e. what shall be his fate.'
 sense is somewhat obscure, and consequently has led to a great variety of interpretations, all of them, I conceive, more or less erroneous. To ascertain the true sense, the scope of the words and their natural import, considered separately and conjointly, must first be examined. Now it is evident that our Lord intended a gentle rebute to Peter for his curiosity on a subject which did not concern himself, and into which it was not proper for him to pry. And ti moos oe was, as appears from the Classical illustratons of Wets. and Kypke, a frequent form of repressing vain curiosity. The chief sense, therefore, to be expressed, must be that assigned by Euthym., ' Do thou mind thine own concerns: mind thy own death, and do not too curiously pry into the manner of that of thy companion.:





 $\pi$ moos $\sigma \epsilon$;

which, though phrased (suitably to what concerns future events, not intended to be fully understood until after they have happened) somewhat obscurely; yet, when we consider that the force of this kind of phrase is to put a negative on any question asked, and that the scope of Peter's inquiry was to know whether John too would suffer martyrdom, the words will readily be granted to contain, together with a mild reproms for the liberty taken, an obscure intimation, that he would not suffer martyrdom, but continue alive up to-what period?-till I come. Now here was an enigma which the Disciples were not likely to misunderstand. The Commentators take this coming of Christ to denote his final advent to judge the world, as if this were only a popular way of expressing, "If I should chase for him not to die at all, what would that be to thee ?" But that, 1 apprehend, would be making the expression more enigmatical than its wording will justify. As to explaining, with many others, the coming of Christ to be the hour of John's death, that has not a semblance of truth. The coming of Christ must, as others of the Commentators have seen, be the coming of Christ in power to execute vengeance on the Jewish nation. That John lived up to and beyond the entire completion of Christ's judgments on the Jewish nation, is well known. As, however, the disciples did not then know of this advent of our Lord, but only of the final one, it is no wonder that they should have then understood it of the other, and consequently supposed that he would not die at all. Taken in this sense, the words contain an obscure prediction, that John would not suffer martyrdom, and would live till Christ came: a prediction verified by the event.

24,25 . ) On these two concluding verses there has been some diversity of opinion. Several eminent Critics and Commentators, even those who receive all the rest of the Chapter, regard these verses as not coming from the Evangelist, but as an addition from another hand. This they are induced to suppose, partly from the change of persons in oinajuev, and partly by a fancied dissimilarity to the style of St. John in the precedeing verse. The latter, however, is an argument of strut: and the former has not much force; though it has been but feebly rebutted by the defenders of the authenticity of the portion, who so distrust their own arguments, as to propose no less than four conjectures, all of them without any countenance from the MSS., and two of which introduce bad Greek! It is strange that the impugners of these two verses should not have seen that, if the rest of the Chapter be (as it certain(! is) from the Evangelist, so must the clause oítos-ypriyas taũta: for this would be requisite to form any conclusion. and would
be a very proper one. And, again, if that clause be from St. John, so probably must the next, since it is strongly confirmed by an altogether kindred passage at xix. 35. Nor is there any such difficulty in oida$a \mu \in \nu$ as to be fatal to the authority of the clause; for it may be taken, not perhaps per enallagen, (plur. for sing.) as many contend, for it would rather be olive; but, as many eminent Critics maintain, communicativè, i.e. to include the disciples and first Christians in general, q.d. "It is known." Indeed, from whom can this clause and the next verse have proceeded, if not from St. John? The Bishop of the Churches of Asia, say the first mentioned Critics. But St. John's assertion could not need the support of their testimony. Besides, the singular oi mat, in the next verse, (which cannot be taken for same) forbids this notion. Are we, then, to consider the last verse as an addition by some hand different from that of the preceding clause? That involves a great improbability ; for surely there would seem to be no need of any addition, at least not to the reader; though the author might see the thing in a different view. Upon the whole, there is not the slightest reason for supposing that the verse came from any other than the Evangelist, who seems to have intended it as a supplement to what was said at $\times \times .30$.
The words oúdé aùrdv oi pa_- $\beta_{1} \beta \lambda i a$ are, as the best Critics and Commentators have been long agreed, an Oriental and hyperbolical mode of expression, to represent that the miracles, the remarkable actions and discourses of Jesus were exceedingly numerous. Of this kind of speaking, many examples are adduced by Bp. Pearce from the Scriptural and the Classical writers, from Homer downwards. And two are cited by Wets. from the Rabbinical writers, so similar, that one might almost suppose this to have been a common Jewish phrase. To the above I have, in Recens. Synop., added others from Eurip. Hips. 1248. Eschyl. Pers. 435. and Eurip. Menalipp. frag. 3. oud' äтas ầ oùpavds, Lids ypaфévtos
 now subjoin Philo Jud. p. 123. D.

It must be observed, that at v.24., the roúravy has reference to the events of this Chapter ; and the taüta, to those of the rest of the Gospel. At $\ddagger \lambda \lambda \alpha \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \alpha$ is plainly to be supplied ${ }_{\alpha}$ ours
 these allusions are occasionally found. Comp. Matt. xi. 21. Acts xx. 35. See a learned tract of Zornius de ajpáфors Christi dictis. We have, however, reason to acquiesce in the Providence of Him who "doeth all things well." Every important purpose in a work meant for the people at large rather than the learned, is served by the Gospels in their present state. Had they recorded "ll the words and actions of



Christ, or even any considerable part, they to direct our faith and regulate our practice: would have been, as the Evangelist perhaps more would have been unnecessary, and, in meana to indicate, too voluminous for a manual some respects, have defeated the parpose in adapted to ordinary use. Enough is recorded view.
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Amongst the other introductory matter to be perused by the student previously to the study of this important Book of the N．T．，I would refer him，besides Mr．Horne＇s，to the excellent preliminary observations by Mr．Townsend，part－ fly formed on some very admirable matter from Bp．Van Mildert，Boyle＇s Lectures，and Jones of Nay land＇s works ；finally，throughout the Book the admirable Lectures of $\mathbf{B p}$ ．Blomfield should be carefully read．
 peel．Mрйтon is for тоórepon；a use（as also that of the Latin primus for prior）frequent in the best writers．No jos in the sense narration of words or actions，history，occurs frequently in the Classical writers．Hence historians were，in early phraseology，called $\lambda$ oyozool；and 入ópoy moteĩolat signified to compose a history．With his Gospel Luke connects the present work，by a fuller account of Christ＇s ascension into heaven． On the use of $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ not followed by od，which often occurs at the beginning of a work，and
 Synop．By the $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ must be understood all things necessary to be revealed．See Joh．$\times x$ i． 25．The $\quad$ ip $\xi a \cos$ is not，as the Commentators imagine，pleonastic；but signifies took in hand， entered upon．It is thus only used of works of great labour and importance．
 striction and interpretation of this sentence， Commentators are not agreed．Most of the later ones would place a comma after $\alpha \pi 0 \sigma \boldsymbol{\delta} \dot{\text { o }}$
 transposing only obs；the antient and earlier
 and rightly；for，according to the former mode， there is violence done to the construction，and more harshness is involved in this transposition of a word than of a clause．Besides，in the former case，the sense is objectionable；but in the latter very apposite．$\Delta c a, \pi \nu ; ~ d \gamma$ ．signifies＇by means of the Holy Spirit．＇＇Evтeidáцevos need not be confined to any one order，but may be ex－ tended to all the injunctions given to them for the right discharge of their Apostolic office．

3．тapéaтท⿱㇒日勺 el．Y．］Not，＇showed himself alive ；＇but，＇proved himself to be alive．＇This use of xapiotávat，which occurs also at xxiv． 13．，is frequent in the Classical writers，and arises from that physical sense by which the word sig－ nifies to place any one down by another．The Part．is for the Infinit．Texunpiocs，＇clear and evident proofs．＇$\Delta i^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \epsilon \sigma \sigma .$, i．e．at in－ tervals during that period．On the several ap－ pearances of Christ during these 40 days，see Bp ．Pearce．
 explaining the subjects pertaining to the Christian dispensation．On this passage Schoettg．has the following excellent annotation．＂Our Lord employed these 40 days in conversing with his disciples on all matters relating to the Constitu－ ton of the Church to be planted and established among the Gentiles．And first concerning doc－ trine，when he inculcated anew the instruction hitherto delivered to them，which，that it might be the more firmly impressed on their memories， was afterwards confirmed at the effusion of the Holy Spirit．（See John．xiv．26．）He then also gave them injunctions concerning the rites and ceremonies to be observed in the Church，as，for instance，in what manner the Sacraments were to be celebrated，the mode and time of assam－ bling together，\＆c．For I must ever maintain that those rites which were now instituted in the Apostolic age，or altered from the hitherto ac－ customed ones，were so constituted by the in－ junctions of Christ himself．＂
 which is preferred by several Critics，but with－ out reason ；for its authority is very slender，and it is evidently a gloss on the somewhat difficult commonly received reading，which is variously interpreted．The antients，and earlier moderns， generally explain it＇convescens，＇by a derivation from $\bar{\alpha} \lambda \mathrm{s}$ and $\dot{\alpha} \lambda a s$ ；the later Commentators， convenient cum illis；taking it in a neuter sense． The former signification is of slender authority， and here unsuitable．The latter is greatly pre－ ferable，and is supported by many passages of the Classical writers adduced by the Commen－




 et 19.4.





入í\}ovтo. \& v. 15. It comes from $\dot{\alpha} \lambda i \alpha$ ，con－ reutus．The construction（which is not per－ ceived by the Commentators）is：cal ova $\lambda_{2}$－
 тарíryєi入ev（aúтоís）．Wakef．has well re－ presented the sense as follows：＇During these communications with them．＇In $\chi$ co $\boldsymbol{i} \zeta \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ we have another example of passive in a neuter sense．

4．dтayze入íay тoù тuтןòs］i．e．the pro－ mixed gift of the Father，the Holy Spirit．See ii．13．It was promised in the prophecies of the O．T．See Joel ii．28．＂Hע グィои́бatє，＇which ye have lately heard of from me．＇Sub．ex or rapaí．See Joh．xiv．26．xv．26．xvi．7．Lu．xxiv． 49．Here is a transition from the ratio ind－ recto to the directs；an idiom peculiar to the familiar style in all languages，but occasionally found in the best ancient writers．

5．тиеи́patt $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\gamma} i \varphi]$ ］This must mean（espe－ cially as there is no Ait．）the influence of the Holy Spirit．Bari\} . ~ s u g g e s t s ~ t h e ~ a b u n d a n c e ~ of the thing．The sense is：＇ye shall be plan－ teously imbued with the influences of the Holy Spirit．

6．$\epsilon 1]$ Some of the Commentators explain the ci mum；others，anion．This peculiar use of the particle seems to have arisen from a blending of the oration directa with the indirecta．
 either consider $\dot{\varepsilon} \nu$＇$\tau \bar{\varphi}$ X Xón $\psi \tau$ ．as pleonastic，or as serving to express anxiety or indignation；or they take it emphatically for，＇at this［so in－ proper］a time．＇The true sense of the clause is， 1 conceive，as follows：＇Is the time now come
 properly to restore any thing，which has suffered change，to its former state ；and it is not unfre－ quently used（as here and in Matt．xvii．11．and Mark ix．12．）of restoring a ruined kingdom or government to its antient form，and there is usually implied some improvement even upon that．Indeed，the Apostles seem to have thought that Christ would restore the kingdom of Judaea to its former consequence，and would conjoin with it a spiritual kingdom，spoken of by the Pro－ phots，（see Is．i．26．ix．7．Jer．xxiii．6．xxxiii． 15－17．Dan．vii．13．sq．Hos．iii．4．sq．Am．ix． 11．Zach．ix．9．sq．）by which the Gentiles who expected salvation must first embrace Judaism．
 your business，it is not granted you to know，＇\＆e． x fóvous $\hat{\eta}$ кatpois．Of these terms，the former
denotes tempos；the latter tempus opportunum． Kuin．，indeed，considers them as here synony－ mous；while H．Steph．，Valckn．，and Wakef．， more properly，take them as put，per hendiadys． for opportunos temporum articulos．But，strictly speaking，the latter term is put by an epanor－ thosis of the former．The whole has the air of a popular mode of speaking，properly used of soldiers，who，as they know not the coins nalpois tips $\mu \alpha \chi^{\prime} \eta s$ ，（of which their general alone can judge，）ought not to pry into or determine on his plans．
 taters，since the time of Kypke，have assigned as the sense，＇hath appointed［i．e．determined］by his own power．＇But this mode of interpretation is somewhat harsh ；and there is no good ground to abandon the old one．I would render，＇hath put into his own power，＇which seems to be a popular form of expression for＇placed at，＇or ＇reserved in，＇＇his own disposal ；＇which，how－ ever，cannot imply that Christ was ignorant of them，but that they were secrets reposed with the Father，which the Son was not authorized to disclose．＇Ep，for els，as often；though the use here arose from a blending of two expres－ sions．
Thus Christ gives them no direct answer to their question，since it was one of curiosity，and not necessary for them to know，especially since something of that they would know at the effusion of the Holy Spirit．

8．$\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \psi$ ．］＇However，ye shall receive．＇ $\Delta \dot{u} \nu a \mu c y$ ．The term here denotes the miraculous gifts of the Spirit；for，as Whitby truly observes． oívapis in the N．T．，when it relates to God the Father，Christ，or the Holy Ghost，imports some miraculous or extraordinary power．Comp．lu． xxiv．50．＇Eлe入日．той $\dot{\gamma} \gamma$ ．Tv．many Com－ mentators take with oúva $\alpha \omega$ ，as in regimen with it．But I doubt whether the proprietas lingua will permit this：and it is excluded by a $\gamma$ ．xv． being here plainly taken in the personal sense． and also，I think，by a kindred passage of Lu．i．


 Judaea only．And so it was probably under－ stood by the Disciples．But Christ，no doubs， meant it of the whole world，（as Ps．xix．5．Is． xlix．6．）agreeably to Ills Father＇s promise，Ps． ii．8．，of＇giving Him the heathen for His inge－ ritance，and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession．＇


 ts ท̄ $\sigma a \nu$ ais tòv oúpavòv, торєvouévov aútov̂, кai idov̀, ăv-











 received him.' 'r'лє $\bar{\lambda} a \beta \in$ is not, as some magive, for $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ ci $\lambda . ;$ but there is a signif. pragn. for
 Valckn. renders.
10. airevi豸ovtes iou] 'were fixedly gazing.' See Note on lu. xxii. 54. Arevǐ. must be construed with cis riv oi ., as is plain from the other passages of the N.T. where the word occurs. Kin., strangely enough, refers it also to тopevopévov.
 They seem to have appeared suddenly and areternaturally. See Note on Joh. xxi. 4. These persons were, no doubt, angels in the form of men. See Scott's references.
11. er $\sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \kappa a \tau e \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \lambda \dot{\epsilon} \pi$.] as in amazement and awe. This sense is in some measure inherent in $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma$ тaкévat; but is severally expressed by added words, as in a kindred passage of Aristoph. cited
 тітүне́vo.

- out cos- ed $\lambda \in \dot{v} \sigma$.] Namely, visibly and in the clouds. See Ian. vii. 13. Matt. xxiv. 30.

12. Eגacōvos] These forms in -iv Dr. Blomfield on Eschyl. Prom. 667. thinks are derived from the Genit. plural of the primitive noun; and Valck. regards the form as having a collective force, and importing plenty.

- $\sigma a / 3 \beta$ átov éXov ósón ${ }^{2}$ Mr. Valpy pronounces that exon is not for ajexov; but that it signifies being, consisting of. The former posiion may or may not be true; but the latter is certainly untenable. Nor is it supported by our common version, or that of Dodder.; for both only give the sense in free translations. Certain it is, that in this kind of phrase distance from must be understood, and it is sometimes expressed by an $\dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\pi} \dot{\delta}$, if not in composition with $\dot{\varepsilon} X \in L \nu$, yet put somewhere in the sentence; as in a kindred

 the $\dot{\epsilon} \chi^{\circ \nu}$ may be sain to be for $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon \chi^{\circ}$ distant,' is almost all Commentators of note from Chrys. in Kin. (supported by the antient Ny. risc) have been of opinion. In both these pas-
sages, the latter clause is exegetical of $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \gamma \dot{u}$ s in the former. A sabbath day's journey, as determined, not by the Mosaic Law, but by the Kabbis, from a calculation of the greatest distance of any part of the camp of Israel from the cabermacle, was 2000 cubits, about $7 \frac{1}{2}$ stadia.
 serves, is properly an adjective signifying upper, with the ellips. of oirnua, which is sometime; supplied. It is (as Bos has seen) not a compound, but a simple. The Commentators are in doubt whether we are to understand an upper apartment of the Temple, or of a private house. The former view is supported by De Dies, Hamm., Schoettg., Vitringa, and Krebs. But there is no one reason for, and many against, that opinion. The words following oi v ii jav катацє́уоขтєs quite forbid it, and show the truth of the common opinion, that it was a large upper apartment of some private house, which served as a common lodging, oratory, \&cc.; for all which purposes the upper rooms in the Eastern countries have always been, for obvious reasons, arefared. Mede, in his Dissertation on the Churches of the Apostolic times, observes, that " the early Christians not having stately structures, as the Church had after the Empire became Christian, were accustomed to assemble in some convenient upper room, set apart for the purpose, dedicated perhaps by the religious bounty of the owner to the use of the Church. Such were distinguished by the name 'Avcógcov or ${ }^{-} \mathbf{Y}_{\boldsymbol{\pi} \in \rho \bar{\omega}} \boldsymbol{0}$, and by the Latins Canaculum, and were generally the mot capacious and the highest part of the dwelling, retired, and next to heaven, as having no other room above it."

If we may rely on early Ecclesiastical tradicion, in a point where it can hardly be supposed to mislead, the room in question was the one in which Christ celebrated the last Passover and instituted the Eucharist; also that in which the Holy Ghost descended; where Matthias was chosen the twelfth Apostle, where the seven Deacons were appointed, and where the first council of Jerusalem was helle. See more in Mete, or Townsend': ('hr. Arr. Vol. it. 26.

## 

 той＇I $\eta \sigma o v ̂$ ，каi бùv тоîs ádє入фоis аúтой．



1 Pal． 41. 11. Joh． 13.18. ct 18.3.








14．тробкарт．іцоӨ．тиิ троб．］Пробкарт－ epeiv is used with a Dative both of person，in the sense to wait upon any one，and of thing，to attend closely to it ；a signification found in the Scriptural and the Classical writers．The use of the auxiliary and particip．for Imperf．of the verb is common in the later writers，and usually strengthens the sense．＇$O \mu \circ \theta$ ．is well explained
 the former sense it often occurs in the Classical writers；and that may here be included．

The words cal $\delta \in \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma!$ are rashly cancelled by recent Editors；since the authority for so doing is very slender，and we can far better account for their being suppressed（namely，through false criticism ）than added．This use of dé $\eta \sigma$ เs（which is not pleonastic，but exegetical，denoting per－ severing and supplicatory prayer）is placed beyond doubt by Eph．vi．18．троткартєри́⿱㇒日є
 cuxais．Phil．iv．6．Heb．v．7．The terms toporevx ${ }^{\text {p }}$ and סénots differ as our prayer and supplication．「uvaıkl cannot，I think，be ren－ dered（as some imagine）＇their wives．＇To that sense the Article would，I apprehend，be indis－ pensable；though Bp．Middlet．thinks not．The sense should rather seem to be＇the women，＇ many of whom，no doubt，were the wives of the Apostles or disciples，and the rest those who had followed Christ out of Galilee，and minis－ tered to him of their substance．
 ＇Now the total number of the names［of the persons here assembled together］was 120 ．Or， indeed，$\delta \nu o \mu$ ．may，with the best Commentators， be taken for persons，as in Rev．iii．4．and often in the Classical writers．At the adverbial phrase $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ тd aúrd scil．Xwoion，sub．zutwn．By the ox $\chi^{\lambda o s}, \& x$ ．is only meant the number then pre－ sent，（the disciples at large being far more nu－ merous）about 600，as we have reason to think．

16．In this address Peter proposes to the dis－ ciples the chusing of another Apostle in the room of the traitor Judas，to complete the original number．He reminds them that the words，not of David，but of the Holy Spirit speaking by David，when he prophesied of Christ，or spake as a type of him，had been fulfilled．In the establishing of which the disposition of the sub－ ject matter partakes of the Jewish character，and is consequently tortuous and obscure．It is， however，much cleared by regarding verses 18 \＆

19．，with the best Commentators，as parenthe－ tical，and as being the words，not of Peter，bat of the sacred Historian，who thus introduces a circumstance respecting this treachery．and what followed it，appealing，for the truth of the latter part of it，to general notoriety．As to the rest． it is quite clear，that at v．20．，Peter adduces two passages of the Psalm（namely，Ixix．25．\＆cix． 8．）as examples of this fulfilment．The scope of that verse，however，is not so evident；but it seems to be this，to allude to a coincidence at least between the case of some companions of David，and that of Judas，as companion and disciple of Cbrist．The Apostle seems to have had in view Ps．xli．9．and lv．12．At the first mentioned passages，however，as affirming that the Holy Spirit spake in them of Judas，certain Commentators stumble，and seek to get rid of the difficulty by construing $\pi \lambda_{\eta \rho \infty} \theta_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{\text {vat }}$ with repl＇Iovióa．But that is not permitted by the
 $\dot{d} i$ or $\check{\text { ci }} \boldsymbol{\tau t \nu t \text { ，is unheard of．And though there }}$ be many passages of both Psalms which are ap－ plicable chiefly or only to David，yet that will he no reason why othen may not have been meant primarily for Christ，and only secondarily for David．And thus there will be no occasion to call in（with Kuin．and many recent Com－ mentators）the convenient，but often objection－ able，principle of accommodation．Upon the whole，we may suppose，with Doddr．，that＂while David prophesied of the calamities which should befal his persecutors，it was revealed to him by the Holy Spirit，that the enemies and murderers of the Messiah should inherit those curses in all their terror，and be yet more miserable than the persons on whom they were more immediately to fall．＂

17．ört］This is best rendered because．The although of Kuin．is precarious．＂Enaxe－bıa－ кovias．Aarxáveiv signifies properly to receive by lot，have allotted to one．The $\kappa \lambda \bar{\eta} p o y$ is not， as Kuin．imagines，redundant，but signifies ap－ pointment．The meaning is，the appointment belonging to this ministry，or office．

18．éктtioato］i．e．was the means of its being purchased．For the best Commentators are agreed，that this is to be referred to that idiom of Scripture by which an action is sometimes said to be done by a person who was the occasion of its being done．See examples in Recens．Synop． Though it may，as I have there suggested，be


















considered as a figurative catachresis，by which Judas night be said to have bought the field with the wages of iniquity，by receiving such wages as would have bought the field．And I have cited as examples 2 Kings v .26 ．and a passage of Achmet Oneiroc．On the difficulty in $\pi \rho \eta \nu \eta$ is

20．On the slight variation between this and the Hebrew and LXX．，see Rec．Syn．＇Eォьокожท＇ signifies any office committed to one＇s charge．
21．Tī̀ $\sigma v \nu \in \lambda$ ．）．Sub．ic．The sense is， ＇who have associated with us，＇formed part of the same society．In $\epsilon \operatorname{loj} \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta_{e} \kappa a l \dot{¿} \xi \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta_{\epsilon}$ there is an idiom formed on the Hebr． $0 \times 3 \mathrm{~s}$ אาב，de－ noting abiding，and equivalent to versatus est． （See Acts ix． 28 ．）It has reference to conduct， manner of life，and administration of office，pub－ lis and private．At $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon$ sub．$\dot{\xi} \xi \dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\nu} \nu$ from غ $\phi, \dot{\mu} \tilde{\mu} \mathrm{s}$ ．See the examples in Recent．Synop．
 is considered Hellenistic；but erroneously，as appears from the example I have myself adduced in Recens．Synop．from Philostratus．
23．ไ̇ $\sigma$ To $\quad$ av］See Note on vii． $59 . \& 6$ ．
 among Commentators whether this be meant of God，or of Christ．The antient and earlier mo－ dern Commentators take it of the latter；the recent Commentators，of the former．That this attribute is ascribed to God in the O．T．，Joseph．， and Philo，is granted．But that it is equally applicable to Christ，appears from Joh．xvi． 30 ．， where see Note．See also Job．i．48－50．ii． 24. vi． 69 ．xxi．17．Apoc．ii．23．Kúpios，too，was a common appellation of Christ，and there would be peculiar propriety in addressing this prayer to Him，as the Head of the Church，and who originally appointed the other Apostles．In this view Mr．Townsend here introduces an able Note on the Divinity of Christ，as proved by the in－ aspired writers every where taking it for granted．
－$\left.\dot{\alpha} \alpha^{\prime} \delta \in \iota \xi o v\right]$ The term is often used of $a p$－


 Versions，and the Ede．up to Stephens，and is received by every Editor from Beng，and Wets． downwards．
25．каi $\dot{\alpha} \pi$ ； $\tau \overline{\mathrm{s}}$ бıaкovias just before．Пaрéß $\eta$ ，laban－ dosed，deserted；by a metaphor taken from a traveller who deserts the right road．Comp． 2 Pet．ii． 15.
－тореv日īvat－iòıov］On the sense of these words there have been many different opinions， which see detailed and reviewed in Recens． Synop．I still think the common interpretation，
 the place suited to him，namely，the place of destruction，is alone the true one，as being re－ commended by its simplicity and suitableness to the usage of the Jewish writers，and confirmed by several passages of the Apostolic Fathers．
26．¿ठoкка⿱亠䒑 « $\lambda$ rufous］The mode in which they cast the lots cannot be determined，various being the methods by which the antients were wont to do it．They used to cast slips of parchment，or pieces of the tabule scriptoria，with the names inscribed，into an urn．And this kind of sortitio most Commentators here understand．Now the lots are said to be their＇s on whom the lots are cast，and fall upon him who comes off successful
 ＇to choose by common suffrages，＇and then＇to number with or unto，＇$\sigma v \gamma \kappa \alpha \tau \alpha \rho t \theta \mu \epsilon i \nu$ ．This deciding of a thing by casting lots was under－ stood to be a mode of showing the will of the Almighty，and was therefore，from the earliest times，resorted to in the creation of kings or ap－ pointment of priests．See the numerous Clas－ sisal citations in Recens．Synop．，and compare Levit．xvi．8．Numb，xxvi．54．Josh，xiii． 6.








1I. $\sigma \nu \mu \pi \lambda_{\eta \rho o u ̈ \sigma t a t] ~ S e e ~ N o t e ~ o n ~ L u . i x . ~}^{51}$. At $\pi \in \nu \tau \eta к о \sigma т \bar{n}$ the old Commentators are at issue whether $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a s$, or $\dot{\epsilon} о \rho \tau \dot{\eta} s$ should be supplied. The recent ones are agreed on the latter. But, in fact, there is no ellipse at all, $\pi \in \nu \tau \eta \kappa$. being a substantice and an appellative. This will afford a solution to several difficulties which are started ly Kuin.

- ทioaväжavtes] The Commentators are not agreed who are here meant. Some say the Apostles only ; others, the disciples at large, mentioned at $i$. 15. The latter, which is maintained by all the best modern Commentators, and supported by the Fathers and antient Interpreters, is undoubtedly the true opinion. For (as Kuin. observes) the sulject at i . 15 . is the assembly of the 120 disciples, whom Peter addressed, and from whom Matthias was taken into the Apostolic body: while the eleven Apostles are only mentioned en passant. Now with the predicate, which is destitute of a subject, the subject immediately antecedent, and not that of which mention was made en passant, but professedly, ought to be taken. This, too, is clear from ámavers, not oivol, being used. Besides, the absence of the rest of the disciples on so solemn a festival is very improbable.
 Like the luctantes venti tempestatesque sonorce of Virgil. This use of $\phi \dot{\epsilon} \rho \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ and its compounds, of the rushing of winds, and associated with moldds, Biatos, and other adjectives of similar signification, is not unfrequent in the Classical writers.
- тdv otrov] What place is meant, Commentators are not agreed. Some think a chamber in the Temple. But this, though supported by several learned Commentators, has never been established on any solid proofs; and there can in little doubt but that the place was the üremainv mentioned at i. 13., a large upper apartment of a private house.

 hinted, Vulg. dispertita, divided. As to the exact mule in which this took place there has been much said, but little made out. To refer it to lightning, or electricity, or resolve all into Oriental metaphor, and Jewish notions, is alike unwarrantable.
 win of a thame of fire being called a tongue. So finp io nunntimes in Hebrew said to lick up what il minannum. Thun far the sense is clear. But u1 iniflore limir is nomu difficulty, occasioned by " 'wilow hurali milijner, which mome would supply

 i). Anrifter to minsalmpled. Ho might have
added, what is more to the purpose, that aveéne cannot be taken from $\pi \nu \epsilon$ únatos afterwards. because that is not in the same sentence ; for, notwithstanding what some think, a new one commences at $\kappa a l \dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma$. Besides, there $\pi r$. a $\gamma$. signifies only the influence of the Spirit, not the Spirit personally. As to the true ellipse the Commentators are generally at fault. Valckn. alone has seen that $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \dot{\alpha} \theta$ ive does not belong to $\gamma^{\lambda \bar{\omega}} \sigma \sigma a t$, or to $\pi u \rho o s$, but that we are to supply


 were seen as it were tongues of fire, distribating themselves, and settling upon them, one on each.' This symbol was meant to typify the gift of tongues, the first fruits of the Spirit.

4. кal $\frac{1}{2} \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \eta \sigma a \nu$ ] 'Then were they filled'
 as much as any others in the N. T. been rexata ab Interpretibus. Various are the hypotheses propounded by recent Commentators. All, bowever, more or less liable to insuperable objections, being contort and far fetched, and doing violence to the sense of the whole passage, and such as no person of sober understanding and competent learning, who had no knowledge except of the passage before him would ever have thought of. Nor is there any phraseology in Pindar himself that comes up to the high-wrought figure thus ascribed to a plain prose narration. Surely so magnificent and august a preparation as the preternatural appearance of the tongues of fire and
 wirel $\pi \cup \rho o \delta s$, suggests the idea of something miraculous, and not that they only prayed and preached with unusual flow of language and fervour. Such a magnificent portal certainly requires a correspondent edifice: and the conversion of the 3000 supposes something miraculous to have taken place. On this subject the reader will do well to consult the able Dissertation of Mr. Townsend, Chron. Arr. Vol. ii. p. 15.
The antient and common interpretation, then, can alone be the true one, which assigns to غ̇тєpais $\gamma \lambda \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma a t s$ the sense 'languages other than those which they were acquainted with,' or 'such as they were ignorant of.' This is confirmed by the words following кatcos $\& c$., where the supporters of the hypotheses above mentioned are compelled to interpret кa日cos postquam, quoniam, or nam; all alike perversions of the plain
 tators have shown) is user of profound, sententious, and also divinely inspired and prophetic language. See examples in Recens. Synop. A more stupendous miracle than this gift cannot easily be found recorded in Scripture.











5．Aatoinoüvtes］These were not，as some imagine，proselytes，but foreign Jews，pious men， who had taken up their sojourn，or residence at Jerusalem，probably to spend their closing years， for the purpose of those greater facilities for religious duties which the place afforded，and because the advent of the Messiah was then ex－ pected．See Tittm．de Synou．p．147．seq．The words aimd mavris \＆cc．are by all admitted to be hyperbolical；of which see many examples in Recens．Synop．This is（as Mr．Scott observes） a general，not an universal proposition．

6．rîs фwṑ taútis］The Commentators are not agreed to what to refer this фwori．Some think it has reference to the ixos at v．2．But that is too remote，and the sense yielded is very unsuitable．It is better，with most Commentators， to suppose $\phi \omega \nu \bar{\eta} s$ put for $\phi \eta^{\prime} \mu \eta \mathrm{s}$ ；a sense often occurring in the LXX．Thus the raúrns will be for $\pi \in \rho i$ тoúrou．As，however，this is some－ what harsh，$I$ should prefer to take $\phi$ oovips（with the antient Versions，and Pisc．，Menoch．，Wakef．， and Kuin．）of the noise produced by the multi－ tucle praying or conversing together，and，no doubt，in great cominotion．This view is con－ firmed by the words following．
－ovvє $\chi^{\dot{u}} \hat{y} \eta$ ］＇was thrown into perplexity．＇ This was their first feeling．Their second was extreme amazement and astonishment，for the
 nymous；though the former is the stronger term， and the latter is rather exegetical of it．

7．「a入ı入aĩot］Most Commentators suppose the auditors wondered that men，by nation Gali－ leans，without the advantages of literature，or intercourse with foreign nations，should speak foreign languages．To this，however，Kuin．has started some well－founded objections．But his own notion，that Galileuns then was the name of the sect，as Christians was afterwards，is unsup－ ported by any proof，and explains nothing．The sense seems to be：＇They were amazed at seeing persons nearly all of one country，（Galilee，as was understood）and that a rustic and barbarous one，all speaking foreign languages，and address－ ing each of them in his own tongue．＇
 mentators have failed to perceive it）is a popular phrase，for the adjective $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \gamma \in v \in i$, ，indigenous，or native．The perplexity of construction which follows is best removed by the mode of punctua－ tion which I have，with Knapp．and Tittm．， adopted．Sub．ס̈vtes．Render，＇We，I say，who are Parthians．＇At dкovionev there is a repetition
in order to clear the sense long suspended by the interposed portion at vv． 9 \＆ 10.
－＇Iovodaiay］At this word the lest Commen－ tators and Critics have with reason stumbled； for what Judera can here have to do，it is not easy to see．As to the defence set up for the word by some Commentators，it proceeds on the supposi－ tion that the language of Judaa was a different one from the Galilaan；whereas there is great reason to think that the latter differed from the former only as the English of Niddlesex differs from that of Somersetshire or Cornwall．Judera， too，would be oddly coupled with Cappadocia． And that a Galilæan should be heard speaking the dialect of Galilee could not be matter of wonder．Besides，the air of the whole list is that of a list of foreigners．Indeed，there is，I think，great reason to suppose that while $\varepsilon \xi-$ ioravro xávtes（at v．7．）is meant of the multi－
 only to the pious Jeus sojourning at Jerusalem， mentioned at v．5．This is plain from v． 12. where see Note．Upon the whole，it should seem that＇Iovoaiay cannot be accounted for in any satisfactory way．As to what the true reading is， we are left to conjecture；for the MSS．（if we may credit the collators）almost all have the common one．Of the various conjectures that have been proposed there is not one but is liable to serious objection，and all are destitute of any countenance from MSS．or lersions．It is strange no one should have seen that the word is from the margin．Of this，indeed，there is no direct evidence except that of Theophylact and the Cod．Reuchl．But that MS．is very antient and valuable．And it is confirmed by the read－ ing＇Iovdaiot，which is attested by the antient Syriac，the Coptic，and probably the Old Italic， since Augustin so quotes．This＇Iovdaiou，how－ ever，cannot be admitted，and，no doubt，was originally only a marginal remark，indicating that all these persons，though natives of or resi－ dent in those foreign countries，were Jeics．

Under these circumstances，amputation is the only cure．As，however，some stronger authority is needed to warrant that，I have been content to place the word within brackets．What confirms this method is，that，so far is the word from being canted，that the text proceeds better without it． For as Parthia，Media，and Elamais make one group，Pontusand Asia another，Phrygia and Pam－ phylia another，Egypt and Cyrene another，so do Mesopotamia andCappadocia well combine，since． they were，at one point，conterminous．














 The Classical writers use the phrase, but with $\pi \rho d s$; of which I have adduced examples in Recent. Synop. ; as also one from Malthus with
 those Jews who were settlers at Rome; which is rendered plain by the added words 'Iovóaiò \&c., indicating that they were Jews by descent, or by adoption and religious conversion. So 'Av. troxeis occurs in Josephus for Antiochian Jews.
11. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \mu e \gamma a \lambda \epsilon i ̄ a]$ Sub. emp $p a$. See Note on Lu.i. 49.
 than dropeiv, and signifies to be utterly at a loss what to do.' By aides are meant all the persons just mentioned, namely, the foreign Jews: to whom are, in the next verse, opposed the ëт spot, meaning those of Judæa. Tit aby $\theta$ el ot тойтo elva is a popular idiom (of which examples are adduced by Wets.) denoting 'what may this mean?' or portend.
13. $\chi^{\lambda \epsilon \cup a ́\} o \nu \tau \epsilon s] ~ ' ~ m o c k i n g, ~ j e e r i n g . ' ~ T h e ~}$ word is best derived from $\chi^{\text {en }}$ is, synonymous with $\chi \in i \lambda o s$, the lip; and signifies to thrust out the lip, as in Ps. xxii. 7.

For $\chi$ גevá\}, a few antient MSS. and some Fathers have stay $\lambda$., which is received by almost every Editor from Griesb., downwards, but without reason; for if the external evidence for the new reading were as strong as it is in fact weak, the internal evidence would decide against it ; since it is manifestly an emendation of the Alexandrian school. Or the $\delta \iota \alpha$ may have arisen from the de preceding. Besides which, $\chi^{\lambda}$ via $Y_{\omega}$ occurs more than once elsewhere in this Book, and often in the LXX; tax., neither in the N. T. nor the LXX.

- $\gamma \lambda$ eúкous] Not, new-mude wine, which is the proper signification of the word; but new, i.e. sweet wine, which is very intoxicating. Mєцect. Me of excess. This was, as Markl. observes, a sneer on the meanness of their condition, since no person of respectability tapped the last year's $\gamma \lambda$ évoss so early as June, unless compelled by necessity.

14. xiv lois ëvo.] Namely, to show their consent and concurrence in what Peter should
say, who was to be spokesman. The sense of the Article here, as often, is ' the other eleven.' 'Exīpe Til ф fou ${ }^{\prime} \nu$. This phrase, used only in Scripture by Luke, occurs also in the Classical writers.

- ávòpes 'Iovóaiot] See the plan of this discourse by Schoettg. in Recent. Synop. The recent Commentators maintain, that only the sense of it is recorded, and that many things are omitted which were said by the Apostle. The former position may be true; but the latter is more than can safely be affirmed. At least an inspired writer cannot omit any thing necessary to be recorded. 'E $\boldsymbol{\nu} \omega \tau$ i $\sigma a \sigma \theta \epsilon$, 'receive into your ears,' ' hearken attentively to.' An Hellenistic and Alexandrian word often occurring in the LXX. and the later Greek writers.

15. $\Phi_{\infty}^{\circ} \rho \alpha$ spit] Before that time none but confirmed debauchees took strong drink, and few took food or drink of any kind. Indeed, to be drunk at any hour of the day was thought disgraceful, even among the heathens.
16. тoü $\left.{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{2} \sigma \tau t\right]$ The sense is: 'this [state of things] is [a fulfilment of] what was gredieted' \&c.

17-21.] This is taken from Joel ii. 28-32., (in the Hebrew, iii. 1-5.) but with some slight difference, partly by inversion of clauses, and partly by supplying from the context what makes the sense more complete; also by the exchanging of one phrase for another which conveys a fuller sense. The passage contains a high wrought description of the state of things which shall precede and accompany the coming of the Messiah, (as the Jewish Commentators themselves admit) namely, in an extraordinary outpouring of the Spirit. But Peter himself did not then understand the full sense of the prophecy as regarded "all flesh," i.e. men of all nations, both Jews and Gentiles. אחר־כ, remdered by the LXX. $\mu e \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau a u ̈ \tau a$, is admitted by Kimchi to be equivalent to the Hebrew words
 in the LXX.; and that is universally granted by the Jewish Commentators to denote the times of
 for $\pi \nu e \dot{j} \mu a$, as in the Hebrew. But it rather seems to be a slight alteration agreeably to the
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${ }^{s}$ ense rather than the words, i. e. a portion of my Spirit. What kind of spiritual effects are meant, is clear from the following words, illustrated by what is recorded in the Acts and Epistles of the Spiritual gifts. 'Eaxéw is, like the correspondent terms in Greek and Latin, used to suggest the exuberance of the gifts mmparted. Aéyet $\dot{\delta}$ Acids is added by Luke, to indicate the speaker. П反̄бау $\sigma \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \kappa \alpha$ seems to mean some of all orders and ranks, and (in a secondary sense) of all nations. See Whitby.

- трифทr.] This must, in the full sense, denote speaking under Divine inspiration, whether by prophecying, (the strict sense) or otherwise. See xxi.9. and Matt, vii. 22. This, of course, includes all the lower degrees of the xpoфøreia, (as in Rom. xii. 6., 1 Cor. xii. 10., xiii. 2.) to denote speaking and teaching the truths of the Gospel, exhorting, \&c., though even there inspiration is implied. The next clause denotes in general that God would reveal his will to both old and young, in a manner which partook of the троф. just before mentioned, namely, by visions and dreams indicating a close union with God. 'Opárets seems to denote the more evident manifestations of the Divine will; and dvúxvia, such as suggest matter for pious reflection or holy admonition.

18. cai $\gamma \epsilon$ ] 'quinetiam,' 'nay further.' This signification sometimes occurs in the Classical writers. Mow has nothing correspondent to it in the Hebrew. But the Apostle has added it, to suggest a second relation of the persons in quession. Thus the sense is: 'Nay, upon the servants of both sexes, such as are my servants, I will pour' \&c. How exactly all this was fulfilled, the New Testament history fully attests.
19, 20. From these verses we are only to infer that the events here predicted would take place at the times of the Messiah. But whether they are to be referred to the first advent of our Lord at the destruction of Jerusalem, or his second at the day of judgment, Commentators are not agreed. They are exactly parallel to, and admit of the same mode of explication as Matt. xxiv. 29. Luke xxi. 26., where see Notes. Aida cai mump are used like our fire and sword.

The $\dot{a} \mu \boldsymbol{i} \delta \alpha$ катиoū is graphic, and completes the picture of devastation. 'H $\mathbf{H}^{\prime} \dot{\rho} a \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi เ ф а \nu \tilde{\eta}$ denotes a day notable for the visitation of God's punishment on the guilty, and therefore awful, or terrible, as the Hebrew is rendered; though the former sense is assigned to the word כורא in other passages.
 tors are agreed, that erik. т $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta \nu} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\mu}$ here denotes religious invocation as a true worshipper. namely, of Christ, by embracing his religion. $\Sigma_{\infty} 0$. denotes not so much temporal deliverance, (to which many recent Commentators confine it) but spiritual deliverance by being received into the Gospel covenant.
22. The Apostle, after having shown that a Saviour had been promised, who should save to the uttermost his faithful worshippers, proceeds to turn their attention to the grand subject of his discourse, showing that Jest's of Nazareth, whom they have crucified, is that personage,-proved to be such by his resurrecion to life, and wherefore raised from the dead. On this is engrafted a notice of the validity of the evidence in favour of Jesus's Messiahship, and the nature of that evidence. Then it is said, that this Jesus, thus raised and invested with supreme dignity, hath procured this pleadutiful effusion of the Holy Spirit, as attested by the effects which they now see and hear. Of Him (the Apostle remarks) the words of Ps. ce. 1. are meant ; which their own Rabies refired to the Messiah. Hence (he concludes) they may be assured that this Jesus, whom they have crucified, is the Lord and Christ appointed of God.

But to consider the passage in detail, the Apostle addresses them by the appellation Israelites, as the most conciliatory he could select. NaYcopaîoy is subjoined to 'I $\eta$ rooù, because in mentioning his name thus formally, it was proper to add, what had indeed become a usual appellative. See Mark xvi. 6. Acts iii. 6. x. 38 . and Note on Joh.i. 45. xix. 19.
 (which has been mistaken by some eminent
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axd Aeou，＇a man approved to you on the part of God［to be a Divine Legate］by signs＇\＆c． Of this sense of $\alpha$ woo．，by which it means to demonstrate，evince，examples are adduced from the Classical writers by Kypke，and Valckn．

 répart，and onpciots are nearly synonymous， but associated to strengthen the sense．They signify every sort of miracle and supernatural work．
 best Commentators are agreed，that $\omega^{\rho} \rho \iota \sigma \mu$ ．$\beta$ ou $\lambda \bar{\eta}$ means the determinate and immutable counsel of God；and that xpoyvioet signifies decree；a signification common both to Hellenistic and Classical Greek．See Recens．Synop．＂Eкסото⿱ doūval or $\lambda a \beta$ civ is a strong term denoting to give $u p$ ，or receive，at discretion，to treat at one＇s pleasure．The expression $\delta i \alpha$ Xecpṑ divóm as conjoined with $\tau \bar{n} \dot{\omega} \rho \iota \sigma \mu$ ．ßou入 $\bar{n}-\Theta \epsilon \circ \bar{v}$ ，is meant to suggest，that God＇s counsels and de－ crees did not absolve these men of guilt in putting Jesus to death，since they were still free agents．A proof，this，how reconcilable are the prescience and decrees of God with the free agency of man．Some，indeed，render ＇hands of the sinners，＇i．e．the Gentiles．But that sense would require $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \mu \omega \nu$ ．Проглrj－ Eavtes scil．oraupa is meant to show that the putting to death was by the most cruel and ignominious mode．

24．$\lambda$ úvas tàs cioìvas toû $\theta a \nu$ ．］The best Commentators antient and modern are agreed that wirivas denotes not pains，but bonds；a sig－ nification，indeed，scarcely known in the Clas－ sical writers，but occurring in the LXX．This interpretation，they say，is supported by the following $\lambda$ úras，and especially by крareíatat， and in confirmed by certain passages cited by Wots．But that $\lambda$ úvas may only mean removed， wihhout any allusion to a bond，will appear from what 1 have annotated on the words dúgav reiv iermatev in Thucyd．ii．101．Engl．Transl．It is bert．therefore，to retain the common version poins，and only suppose that in coareiootac there is all wllusion to the notion of tight bands，as in ．Vlian．11．A．12．5．toùs two wíivwn 入ú Dormuй．This might more easily occur，because cho mame llobrew word חבל differently pointed， ilenotew cither a tight rope，or a pang．
－oik jiv duvardv］Inasmuch as He had life in himself，Joh．v．26．，and was the＂Prince of life．＂For the duv．is taken in a popular sense to denote，as Scott explains，＂impossible，consist－ ently with the dignity of His Person，the nature of Ilis undertaking，the perfecting of His work， the purpose of God，and the predictions of Scripture．＂
 ence to，＇him．Whether this reference be pri－ mary or secondary，Commentators are not agreed． The most eminent Interpreters and Theolo－ gians have long been of opinion that this 16th Psalm has in many of its parts a double sense， one Historical，of David，the other mystical and allegorical of Christ．Be that as it may，the latter，if secondary in order，is primary in imp－ portance．It should seem that David spoke in the person of the Mexsiah．
－тоошрю $\mu \eta \nu$ ］This may be considered as an Aorist expressive of habit，＇ 1 have set and do
 be so mindful of as to set always before us．＇By the Lord is meant his power to save．The words
 what light the Lord is considered，namely， 33 a helper．The Commentators think there is here an allusion to those rapáx $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{\eta}$ tot，who stood as any one＇s supporters when he was brought to trial．With these may be compared the wapa－ $\kappa \in \lambda e v \sigma \tau o l ~ к а \forall \dot{j} \mu \in \nu o \iota ~ m e n t i o n e d ~ i n ~ T h u c y d . ~ v i . ~ . ~$ 13．＂I $\nu \alpha \mu \eta{ }^{2} \sigma \alpha \lambda .$, ＇that I should not succumb or fall under calamity．＇

26．єن́ф $\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \eta$ ท̀ карঠía $\mu o v]$ This and ท่ $\gamma a \lambda \lambda$ ．i）$\gamma \lambda \cos \sigma \sigma \dot{\alpha}$ uou are meant to denote extreme joy both heartfelt，and expressed． ＇Eл＇ $1 \lambda \pi$ ．，namely，of being raised．See Rom．viii． 21.

27，eis ädov］scil．dómov，or olkov．See Notes on Math．xvi．18．Lu．xviii．23．and v． 31. Oúdè ówírets，＇nor wilt thou suffer．＇For dıdóvat， like the Hebr．נט，denotes sometimes not a phy－ sical，but a moral giving．Tdy öбוóv oov．This is usually rendered＇thy pious worshipper；＇a sense which may very well suit David，but not Christ．The sense must be，＇me who am pre－ eminently the Holy One，and thine，as united to Thee in the Godhead．＇＇İeīv dıaф0opúv．By Hebraism，for＇to experience putrefaction，＇i．e． to lie as long as to be expowed thereto．See Whitby．



 known (i.e. openest for us) paths of life,' i.e. the means of avoiding permanent death, and attaining unto life. The next clause adverts to the state of glory, and the fulness of joy which should succeed to that "earthly race which was set before him ;" after which he should sit down at the right hand of God and be blessed with His immediate presence.
29. The Apostle now proceeds to establish his foregoing argument, resting on the position, that the Messiah is meant in the Psalm in question. And this he does by tacitly encountering an objection which might be made, q.d. These are the words of David, and are to be understood of him. In answering which, the Apostle introduces the mention of David in very respectful language, calling him Patriarch. - I may be permitted (says be) freely to tell you concerning the Patriarch David, that he both died and was buried, and his sepulchre remains unto this day!' And as David died, was buried, and his body experienced corruption, so it followed that in the passage adverted to he must have spoken not of himself:
30. In this and the next two verses the Apostle draws tight the argument; the sense may be thus expressed. 'Now he being a Prophet, (i.e. one endowed with a supernatural knowledge of future events) and in that quality knowing that God had sworn a solemn oath to him that from the fruit of his loins (i.e. from his posterity) Christ should, as to his human nature, descend, in order to sit on his throne; he, foreseeing this event, spoke (in the passage in question) of the resurrection of Christ, when he said that his soul' \&c. On this promise see 2 Sam. vii. 1116. and the other passages adduced in the references. The expression $\ddot{0} \rho \kappa \varphi \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\mu} \sigma \epsilon$, as applied to God, denotes only 'His fixed and immutable purpose,' sanctissimé promisit.

The words to катà ба́pка-X without reason rejected by Mill and Beng., and cancelled by Griesb. and Knapp. The authority for this omission is exceedingly small; only that of 3 or 4 MSS.; for the reading of the Cod. Cantab. is, as Griesb. has omitted to notice, (from Wets.) er emendations. And that the words were in the Archetype is plain, by their being found in the venerable Latin Version which accompanies the MS. Of the three MSS. which are said not to have the words, the Barb. 1. is of no authority. The other two are the Cod. Alex. and Cod. Ephr., two very antient MSS., but which bear perpetual marks of the liberties taken with them by some Biblical Critics of an early period. The words are found in all the other MISS., (not far short of 200 ) including the most antient of MSS., the Cod. Vaticanus, 1209. Thus the external evidence for the omission in question is exceedingly slight. As to the internal. it is infinitely more probable that the words should
have been omitted in two or three MSS. by accident, or perhaps removed designedly by the Pelagians, than that they should have been foisted into all the other MSS. The evidence, indeed, of the Versions may seem more in favour of the omission. But let us examine. Those versions are the printed Syriac (Peshito) the Vulg., Copt., Ethiop., and Arm. Now though the printed Syriac has them not, yet the MSS., 1 learn, have. And, at all events, the authority of the Syriac in the Acts and Epistles is very far inferior to that in the Gospels, it being supposed to be of a much more modern date, and not unfrequently altered from the Vulg. The authority of the Vulg. may seem weighty ; but it is, in fact, not so in cases where it is unsupported by the antient Italick. And that the words were in that Version, is plain from what is brought forward by Sabatier. See Matthæi and Nolan p. 390. As to the Fathers, some of them, indeed, adduce the verse without the words in question. But others, as Theophyl., Theodoret, and especially Chrysost., cite the verse with those words. And in them the evidence for insertion is much stronger than for omission, since citing, as they perpetually do, from memory, they often omit what is not to their purpose. Heinrich and Kuin. catch at an argument for their omission, from the words being variously placed in the MSS. But the truth is, that in only some two or three MSS. is there a transposition, evidently from the carelessness of scribes; which, of course. proves nothing. As to the argument with which those two Commentators aim at giving the coup de grace to the words, namely, that the omission of the words produces a more difficult reading, and therefore the more likely to be genuine, it is an argument of straw ; for even that Critical Canon, like most others, has its exceptions. Here, surely, it cannot apply; for it would leave a most harsh ellipse of diva. As to the argumentum ad verecundiam, consisting in the authocity of names, we may very well oppose to those of Mill, Beng., Schoettg., Griesb., Knapp, Heinrich, and Kuin. those of Grot., De Dieu, Wolf, Wets., Math., Tittm., Nolan, and others.
1 should not have thought it necessary to consider this question so much at large, were it not for an attempt which has recently been made, by a writer of some ability, in the Monthly $V$ visitor, (the organ of Unitarianism) to sink this evidence for the Divinity of Christ, by holding up all defence of it as weak and absurd. The writer concludes by saying that "this spuriousness is a fact with which the author of the Recess. Synop. ought to have been acquainted." Whether it be a fact, my readers will judge for themselves. Perhaps even the writer in question will now be ready to admit, that it is not such; and to grant that he has pronounced not only "with considerable confidence," but, perchance, with some degree of presumption; for the direct arguments
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are light as thistledown, and the argumentum ad verecundiam above mentioned comes with an ill grace from those who are so accustomed to scout this bending to the authority of names, this " jurare in verbs magistri."
32. тoütov $\tau d \nu$ 'I. \&ic.] The Apostle leaves it to be inferred from this, that Jesus was the Messiah. The evidence for this resurrection is then touched on, by adverting not only to the positive testimony of the Apostles, disciples, and other eye-witnesses, (as contrasted with a want of evidence on the part of the Jews, that he did see corruption and did not rise) but to that trestimony of his resurrection (and consequent Messiahship) afforded by his exaltation to the right hand of God; by his having obtained (agreeably to promise) the Holy Spirit and the copious effusion of His gifts, producing effects such as they now see and hear, and which, by their miraculous nature, attest the Messiahship of Him who procured them.
34. oi y $\alpha \rho \Delta a \beta 1 \delta \& c c$.] $\Delta a \beta l \delta$ is emphatical ; and, as Mr. Holden observes, the Apostle's argument is this: That David speaketh concerning the Messiah (as cited v. 25 . et seq.) is clear from Ps.cx. 1., where he speaks of $A$ Lord who was to be at God's right hand till all his enemies were subdued. For that patriarch is not raised from the dead, and " ascended into the heavens" to God's right hand, therefore he must have spoken this of some other person, namely, of Jesus Christ, " who hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear." The concluding words suggest the certainty of their own ruin, if they continued to reject Jesus Christ.
36. Here we have the conclusion, that this
same Jesus whom they had crucified was the divinely constituted Lord and Christ.
 at the heart. Karayúgototat signifies to be pricked through, and is used of the emotions of violent grief or remorse, whether expressed is words, or silent. See Ecclus. xii. 12. xx. 21. elvis. 21. Susan. 11. Ps. iv.5. Wets, and Kypke andduce several Classical examples, of which, however, one only is quite apposite, namely, Simplicius on Evict. wis tours $\mu \eta^{\prime}$ тávтшos vejexper
 Recent. Synop. added from Liban. тoútous kep-

 reformation, both by an abandonment of their Jewish prejudices, and by acknowledging Jesus as the Messiah, and embracing his religion in baptism, and thereby engaging to observe all his injunctions.

- Tiv doopeà roup eiरiov rueúp.] By this seems to be chiefly meant, not the miraculous gifts before adverted to, but, as appears from what follows, the ordinary aids and influences of the Spirit given to every man to profit withal.
39., iцiv-ท' dray.] ' to you belongs the promise, namely, of sending the Spirit. Max $\varepsilon$ lois els $\mu a \kappa$. These words must, notwithstanding the dissent of some, mean the Gentiles, as aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. See $x .45$. xi. 15-18. xiv. 27. xv. 3. Eph. ii. 12. sq: These the Apostles then thought would be received into the Messiah's kingdom by becoming proselytes to the Jewish religion. See iii. 25. Ifookcal.: 'shall or may call,' namely, by the preaching of the Gospel.
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40．ঠєецарти́рєто каl тар．7．＇did he earnestly charge and exhort．＇See 1 Tim．v．21． 2 Tim． ii． 14.
－$\sigma \omega^{\prime} \theta_{\eta}$ re］＇save yourselves，＇suffer your－ selves to be saved，or put into the way of saiva－ tion．There is also in $\sigma c^{\prime} \theta$ ．a signification pregnans， since it includes the notion of withdrawing，con－ sequent on an attempt to save oneself from danger． To the latter sense the words following refer． Exo入tâs．The term signifies perverse and gene－ rally wicked，by a metaphor taken from what is crooked as opposed to straight．The phrase is borrowed from Deut．xxxii．5．yevea oxo入ía cal disorpa $\mu \mu$ évŋ．
41．out］A particle of transition．＇Agrévoos． This is omitted in a few antient MSS．and Fathers，and is supposed spurious by some Biblical critics；but wrongly；for it was avi－ dently either omitted by the scribes through inadvertence，or cancelled by the antient Critics， because it seems not very necessary，nay comes in somewhat awkwardly．That，however，is only by regarding the of as a relative；which yet is not quite necessary，for ot is here used with $\mu$ iv as the Classical writers use it with $\delta \delta$ ，and thus comes from $\dot{\boldsymbol{j}} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ to．We may，then，render：＇And they indeed thereupon gladly receiving his word （or exhortation）were baptized．＇This view is confirmed by the Syriac and Arabic translators． ＇Atrodex herat，as used of things，signifies to ap－ prove，\＆c；and is often accompanied with dg $\mu$ enos．＇ $\mathrm{E} \beta a \pi \tau i \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ ．In the first age of Christianity，those who acknowledged Jesus to be the Messiah were received，by this solemn rite，into the Christian Church；so that a fuller instruction did not precede，but follow baptism． We need not suppose（because távres is not added）that all were baptized；though 3000 must have formed a very considerable part of the multitude．П $о о \sigma e e^{\prime} \theta \eta \sigma \alpha \nu_{1}$ ，ese adjunxerunt； Pass．for Middle，as often in this word．The use of $\psi u x a l$ for persons is common to the Clas－ sical as well as Scriptural writers（See examples in Recess．Synop．）as the Heb． Indeed the idiom is found in all languages．
42．Having recorded the amazing increase to the members of the visible Church，the Apostle takes occasion to notice their manner of living， and by тробкарт．Tin didax $\bar{y}$ he hints，as an under sense，that they continued steadfastly to adhere to that profession which they so suddenly had taken up；though the words properly mean， ＇they were intently engaged on the Apostles ${ }^{\text {＇}}$
doctrine．＇See Rom．xiii．6．Of кoıvavía the sense is much disputed，（See Recens．Synop．） and nothing certain can be determined．Many suppose $\tau \bar{j}$ coin．cal $\tau \hat{y} \kappa \lambda d \sigma e l$ to be put by Hendiadys．But that figure cannot here have place．To take（with some）the cal for $\eta$ your， would be straining the sense．The term may mean intimate society one with another；but the most eminent modern Commentators take it to denote that communication of each other＇s goods which is more expressly mentioned at v ．44．Or if the word has an especial reference to the fol－ lowing ones，it may（as many think）allude to those agape which used to precede the Lord＇s supper．let I cannot but suspect that those agape were not yet in being，and originated at a later period，when the custom of having all things in common，practicable in a small society， was altered into that of formal communion in the agape．

The $\kappa \lambda$ digest тoù äprou is by many antient and modern Commentators understood of the Eucharist；but by others，more properly，of a common meal．

43．Td $\sigma \eta \psi \psi x \bar{\eta}]$＇every person，＇namely，of the multitude at large，the $\mathrm{\lambda}^{2}$ vv roy $\lambda a \delta \nu$ men－ toned at v．46．$\Phi$ of kos，＇reverential awe．＇The next words indicate of whom and why．

44． $\bar{\eta} \sigma a \nu \dot{j} \pi \dot{l} \tau \dot{d}$ avid］On the sense of this expression there is some diversity of opinion． The earlier modern Commentators take it to be ＇were collected together［for worship］；＇and as 3120 persons could not meet for that purpose in the same house，they suppose that the Society was divided into many lesser bodies，meeting at some common house，or some house in rotation． Most recent Commentators，however，take the expression to denote community of sentiment， i．e．unanimity and concord，referring to iv． $32^{\circ}$ ． and Ps．xxxiv．4．This，however，is harsh．Be－ sides，i．15．and v．1．of this Chapter seem to de－ termine the sense to meetings for religious war－ ship．And as to the objection that all could not meet at one place，it is of no great weight；for if even the same day were kept，yet in the course of it as many successive meetings might be held as would embrace all who were able to attend． After all，however，may not the sense be，＇and all the believers kept much together as a distinct society？
－«ixov äxayta коぃdi］．The earlier Com－ mentators understand by this a perfect comma， pity of goods；while many recent ones think







that the words are to be taken only in a popular
 ra кotva, as indicating great charity and beneficence. The next verse, however, excludes this latter view; yet it does not necessarily imply the former. Some, nay several, might sell their property, in order to have more to give immediately to their poorer brethren; but the money accruing from thence might not cease to be at their own disposal. This is plain from iv.32. v.4. \& xii. 12. That all did not sell their property, is evident from the fact, that there were soon after rich and poor among them. See ix. 36. xi. 29. xx. 35. 1 Cor. xvi. 1. Eph. iv. 28. In fact, this community was, no doubt, very limited; any sale for distribution being far from general, and the distribation itself varying ; though the members, we may suppose, for the most part, influenced by the admonitions of our Lord, as enforced by the A postles, regarded their wealth as held in trust for the advantage of their fellow Christians. They have been thought by some to have, in this, imitated the example of the Essenes. But there is little probability in the supposition; though the tenets of those ascetics may afterwards have had their effects on the opinions and practices of the early Christians. There is little doubt that the community in question (which was voluntary and limited in operation) was produced by the peculiar circumstances of the infant Church at Serusalem, composed as it was, in a great measure, of foreign Jews sojourning there, and detained by the natural wish of acquiring a thorough knowledge of the religion which they had adopted; and yet whose funds might, by their detention so much longer than they had expected, have fallen short, and thrown them on the charitable assistance of their richer brethren; who might be induced, by the above and other reasons suggested by Doddr., to not only contribute their ready money, but even occasionally to sell part of their possessions.
45. ктímata] might denote possessions or property in general ; but here it must be understood of the bona immobilia, (lands and houses) as
 note distribution by the hands of others as well as their own.
46. тробкарт.] The modern Translators render 'continued; ' but the antient ones, better, perseverabant. For (though the Commentators observe it not) тробк. is put for $\pi$ робк. тais mpogeuxais which occurred a little before. Render: 'They attended the Temple service every day,' i.e. (as is implied) at the stated hours of prayer.
 many understood of the agape which preceded the Eucharist. But others, with more reason, understand it of common meals taken by com-
panies in certain houses in rotation. At кat' oiko sub. éкаотоу; an ellipee frequent in adverbial phrases formed of a noun with кata. Mede and Townsend, however, take it to mean
 appropriated to prayer. The phrases ${ }^{2} \nu \dot{\alpha} \dot{\alpha} \dot{d} \lambda$ -入td́бet-кapdias denote, I conceive, the disp? sition of mind of the partakers; though there is some difference of opinion as to their sense. If the terms have each reference to all classes of persons assembled, I would still explain, as in Recens. Synop., 'the rich rejoicing that they could exercise their liberality towands the poor; and the poor rejoicing in and thankful for the liberality of the rich. And this joy we are to believe was unfeigned, arising out of their matual love and unanimity. The rich were removed from all pride and ostentation, and the poor from all envy and ill will;' an interpretation confirmed by the use of the word dqei. in Plutarch T. ii. 461. in the sense modestia. Perhaps, however, that term has reference only to the rich, i. e. those at whose houses these meals were taken in rotation, and denotes sincere liberality removed from all pride and ostentation. So Plutarch de Deo Socr. 'Awôpos áreqia кai dфелеі́a.
47. alvoüures-入aóv] This may signify in a general way. 'They were [in their mode of life] much occupied in prayer, and were in favour with the people:' an interpretation confirmed by the old Syriac Version. As, however, alvoüvees is grammatically connected with $\mu$ ere$\lambda \alpha^{\prime} \mu \beta a \nu o \nu$, it seems better to suppose the sense to be: 'And these common meals they held with prayer to God, and by the use of these and by their general conduct, they were in favour with the people at large,' i. e. all except the Rulers and Priests and their party.
 but a Calvinist would have rendered 'such as should be saved,' as if it were roùs $\sigma$ m 0 noopévous. This must be rejected, as unfounded, and as inconsistent with the use of the Article, and as introducing irrelevantly a most mysterious doctrine (Election), which, whether true or not. could have no place here. For, as Wets. observes, St. Luke speaks as a historian, of a thing which fell under his own view, of a fact relating to the Jews, not to the hidden counsels of God. To effectually exclude such a sense, some zealous Anti-Calvinists have assigned to $\sigma \omega \overline{\text { Y }}$ a pass sense, 'such as had been saved;' (see Pearce) though, in fact, that equally favours Calvinism. An interpreter, however, of the N.T. is to think of neither Calvinism, nor Arminianism, nor any other system, to turn neither to the right hand
 $d \lambda \eta \theta$ elas. This may here be best done by keeping (as Bp. Middlet. admonishes) to the Present
















tense．Yet a present sense will not here suit the context．And it is strange that the learned Prelate did not see this，and remember that when a Participle present immediately follows a verb in the Imperfect or Aorist，it may，nay，must be expressed in an Imperfect sense．Thus the sense here is that expressed by Montanus，Grot．，Wolf， and Dr．Maltby，＇those who were being saved，＇ put into a state of salvation，＂as opposed（says Markl．）to the oi dxo入入úuevos at 1 Cor．1． 18. and 2 Cor．ii．15．＂namely，by abandoning Jewish superstition，and embracing the Christian reli－ gion．The very same sense is found supra v． 40. And so ol бw！́ómevol at Revel．xxi． 24 ．

By Ḱpoos is，I think，not meant，as Commen－ tators imagine，God，but Christ，who is said to bring men to God．Thus suprav．36．God is said to have made Jesus both Lord and Christ．

III．1．${ }^{2 v d \beta} \beta$ acvov］Render，＇were going up．＇ The dè just before is transitive，now．＇ETl $\tau \boldsymbol{d}$ au＇d must here mean together，in company，as in Joseph．cited by Krebs．Méxpi＇Avtıoxelas $d \pi l$ Td avird тapyinoov．The use of $d \pi l$ with an Accus．in the sense to，is found also in the Classical writers，and especially $\begin{aligned} & \text { th } \\ & \text { nouns of }\end{aligned}$ time．Triv dyváтทy are put por opanorthosix， and exegetical of the preceding．
 Joh．ix．1．＇Bx yaotpos occurs in the Pseudo－ Theogn．v．307．＇Eßactá\}ero,' was being carried．＇＇Eritoov，＇they used to lay．＇The sick and poor were，both among Jews and Gentiles （as we learn from the researches of antiquaries，） usually laid or placed themselves at the portals of the Temples，to ask charity of the worship－ pers ；and sometimes at the gates or doors of rich men．See Lu．xvi．20．and Note．
－＇Opaiav］So I write，with almost every Edi－ tor up to Wets．Those after him write cipaiay； but wrongly，I conceive；for wip．is a proper name，being one of that class which become such by an adjective with the Article having so de－ fined some one of a class of things，that it is pointed out as single and apart from the rest． In that stage the adjective should be written
with a small initial letter．But when the Article is omitted，it becomes a proper name，and conse－ quently must have a capital．Which gate of the Temple is here meant，the Commentators are not agreed．It seems to have been either the Eastern gate，leading from the court of the wo－ men to that of the Israelites，formed of Corinthian brass wrought with consummate skill；or that called Susan．
－alreîv d $\lambda$ ．］＇to ask an alms，＇i．e．the stips or sum given；a signification only found in the later Greek writers．

4．ditevioar els aírdy］．＇looking fixedly at him．＇See Note on Lu．xxil． 56.

5．dreĩxev a．］Sub．$\delta \phi \theta a \lambda \mu$ oúg．See Note on Lu．xiv．7．This，of course，implied attention．

6．$\hat{o}$ ot＂x $\chi \infty$ ，тoüto $\sigma 0 t$ did．］This has the air of a proverbial expression，as may，indeed， be inferred from the passages 1 have myself ad－ duced in Recens．Synop．Aristoph．in Lysist．

 ๔บ่тธ̣．
－dv $\tau \underset{\sim}{-1} \delta \nu$.$] ＇by the authority and power．＇$
7．dгтe $\rho \in \cos ^{\prime} \theta_{\eta \sigma \alpha y}$ ］＇were rendered firm．＇Bd－ ress．The word properly signifies a step；and some here render it planta pedis；but others， better，feet；a signification not unfrequent in the later Greek writers，from whom many ex－ amples are adduced．The oфvpa are the ancles or instep．

8．dそa入入ómevos］Not so much for joy，as many Commentators imagine；nor，as Cecumen． thinks，to try whether he could walk；but，it should seem，（as 1 suggested in Recens．Synop．） from ignorance how to walk，by which his trial would be rather leaping than walking；just as the imperfect glimmer of the first acquired sight of the blind man（at Mark viii．24．）made him first＂see men as trees walking．＂＇E $\boldsymbol{\xi}^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma 0 a t$ well describes the headlong eagerness of the incipient action，and＂Eनтク，кal териет．the other stages of it：＇he first leaped，then stood still，and［then］walked，＇i．e．in a regular man－ ner．See Note on Acts xiii． 11.
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11. кparoivros] Not 'kept hold of,' but, in a figurative sense, 'kept cloee to,' as in Col. ii. 19. 2 Sam. iii. 6.
12. $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{2 \pi e x p . ~ \pi \rho d s ~ \tau d \nu \lambda .] ~ ' a d d r e s s e d ~ t h e ~ p e o-~}$ ple.' Ev̇бeßeia, præ sanctitate.

- тeส. toì tepit. a.]. There is here an anomaly of construction, which some Commentators seek to remove by supposing an ellipsis of $\pi \rho a \hat{\gamma \mu \mu}$ and ëveкa. Others, as Markl. and Heinrichs, by resolving mē. into roıทraīs oü̃t; comparing Acts $x \times v i i$. l. cis dè ékpi0 $\eta$
 ciple of resolution, though often employed by Philologists, is seldom with effect, as being so hypothetical, and explaining nothing solidly. The ellipses, too, in question are liable to the same objection. It should seem that the present idiom proceeded originally from the employing of the Infinitive with שiorse or els rod denoting and or aim. This construction was afterwards changed to its equivalent $\tau 0 \bar{u}$ with an lnfin., which is often found in the LXX. (see Win. Gr. Gr. $\$$ 38. 2. No. 3.) and was then changed in most cases to the simple Infinitive. The idiom formerly existed in our own language, and is still used by the vulgar, e. gr. "I should like for to know."

13. $\dot{o}$ Өeds-r/uciv] The repetition of $\dot{\delta}$ Өeds is emphatical ; and, as Doddr. observes, the mention of the God of their Patriarchs was introduced to show that they taught no new Religion which should alienate them from the God of larael. Maî́o, for ulóv, 'E\&ógace, 'has made (20) Messiahship evident,' namely, by his resurrection and what followed. Mapedioncate, namely, to the Romans, when they cried 'Crucify him!'
'Hpviracote is well explained, by Kypke, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ renounced and denied him as Messiah.' Kpivatros, ' when he had determined,' 'was minded.' Of this sense examples are adduced by Krebs and Loesner.
14. Tdy äytov кal Xiк.] 'the Holy and Just one.' A cognomen of the Messiah, as in iv. 27. Rev. iii. 7. Joh. x. 36. With tivioaס日e-viniv I would compare Hesiod. 'E $\rho \gamma$. 190 . $\mu \bar{a} \lambda \lambda$ or $\dot{d e}$
 This sense of $\chi$ ap., to be given up for pardon, is not unfrequent in the later writers.
 See Joh. i. 4. v. 21. xiv. 6. and the Note. So Hebr. ii. 10. d $\rho \mathrm{X}$. тทิs $\sigma \omega$ тnpias. It is here observed by Valckn. that in these speeches of Peter, though not such pieces of finished composition as those of Demosthenes or the other Greek writers, there is a dignity in the historical and a grandeur in the didactic parts, to which it were impossible to add aught.
15. кal $d \pi l$-aivoū] Render: "And his name (i.e. the power accompanying the invocation of his name) through faith in his name (i.e. him) hath made strong this man whom ye see and know.' 'Oגoкגmpiav, complete soundness and health, as in Is.i.6. and sometimes in the later Classical writers.
16. кar' dyyotav dTp.] "It is somewhat difficult (says Mr. Townsend) to interpret these words in their literal sense, when we remember the numerous miracles of our Lord, and the abundant proofs the Jews received that he was their promised Messiah." Wolf and others, indeed, adopt a different punctuation, and think the expression $\begin{gathered}0 \\ \sigma\end{gathered} f$ кal ol $d \rho X$. i $\mu \omega \bar{y}$ belongs



 троби́тои той Kирív，каi áтобтєí入n тòv трокєхеєрьб－

not to diyvosay，but to expókare．And they assign the following sense ：＇ 1 know that through ignorance you were induced to do as your rulers did．＇This，however，violates the construction． The difficulty may be best removed by not too rigorously interpreting either oioja ört，（which has often but a faint sense）or dyvosay，but taking the whole as expreseed populariter，q．d． ＇I am willing candidly to suppose，＇\＆c．See Scott．＂Ayvocav may（as Whitby proposes）be taken of error，or prejudice．At all events，Peter does not say that their $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \nu o \iota a$ ，whatever it might be，was blameless；for it resulted from pride， prejudice，and worldly mindedness，and among such means of information，was criminal．Nor was ignorance ever held as an excuse for crime， unless involuntary，when all the antient moralists granted it was．See my Note on Thucyd．iii． 38 \＆40．iv．98．Thus Paul in 1 Tim．i．13．urges ignorance in extenuation of his guilt．Criminal， however，as was the ignorance in the present case，the A postle hints that it admitted of some extenuation；thus throwing open to them the doors of repentance．
 hath used that ignorance for good，by permitting that you should commit this crime；and more－ over，since thus would be fulfilled the declara－ tions of the Prophets concerning the ills with which the Messiah should be oppressed．The Rabbins themselves acknowledge that all the Prophets prophesied of the Messiah．

19．метауоウ்．каl елсनтр．］This is the ap－ plication of the discourse，in which extar．is not（as many recent Commentators imagine）a mere synonyme of $\mu$ eтav．；but，as the latter de－ notes a change of mind，so does the former a change of conduct；both necessary to real con－ version．
 signifies properly to uipe off oil from any thing， and sometimes to wipe off characters chalked on a board or traced on a slate；3dly，to obliterate any writing，whether on waxed tablets，or writ－ ten on parchment，either by scratching or crossing out．And，as crossing out accounts in a ledger implies that the sums are discharged，or the pay－ ment forgiven，so the word came to mean，in a figurative sense，to forgive offences，as in Is．xliii． 23．（which the Apostle has，no doubt，in mind）
 2 Macc．xii．42．and Ecclus．xlvi．20．This sense very rarely occurs in the Classical writers．One example，from Lysias，has been adduced by
 mata．On the kindred notion of erpunging and consigning to oblivion，see my Note on Thucyd． iii．57．To the examples there adduced may be added Fiechyl．Ch．496．\＆Theb．15．Joseph． p．787． 17.

are by no means agreed on the exact sense of these words．That will depend upon the force to be ascribed to $\%$ roos $\dot{\alpha} \nu$ ，which most modern Commentators suppose to be when，or after that， taking it for ereidav；others，until，i．e．waiting until．The latter，however，supposes a harsh ellipsis；and as to the former，though examples of ${ }^{\circ} \pi \cos$ in sensu xpovincî are not rare，yet we meet them not with äv．Besides，turn it which way we will，it vields no satisfactory sense．See Scott．It is therefore better，with the Syr． Transl．，and many eminent Commentators，to take it in the sense in order that，as Lu．ii． 35. Matt．vi．5．et alibi．
－кatpol $\dot{v} a \psi \dot{\prime} \dot{\xi} \in \operatorname{ses}$ ］times（not＇the times＇） of refreshment，rest，and bliss．＇Avá廿uEis pro－ perly denotes a taking breath after it has been interrupted；2．a breathing－time from some labour，a rest from trouble，deliverance from evil，dueats，in which sense it occurs in the LXX．and Philo cited by the Commentators，to which I have in Recens．Synop．added some examples from the Classical writers．See Note on Hebr．iii．11．The Apostle（as Doddr．ob－ serves ）seems to have thought that the conversion of the Jews，as a people，would be attended with some extraordinary scene of prosperity and joy， and open a speedy way to Christ＇s descent from heaven，in order to the restitution of all things． See Mr．Scott＇s able vindication and illustration of the above sense．
－ג่ тd т plying by His Providence．Kal बंжобт．，＇and that he may send．＇Instead of the common read－ ing трокекприyuévov some of the most antient MSS．，most of the antient Versions，and all the early Edd．，except the Erasmian，have трoкe－ xerpıoцévov，which is confirmed by several of the antient Fathers，has been approved by most Commentators，and has been received by almost every Editor from Beng．and Wets．downwards； and justly；for the common reading seems to have been a paradiorthosis of some Critics who did not understand tpoкехetp．；or a gloss on трокехеเр．；for Suid．explains троXecpi\}co by тẫt $\gamma$ veopıдdy поь $\bar{\omega}$ ．Render：＇him who was of old destined and appointed for you，（i．e．for your relief and salvation）even Jesus Christ．＇ Some would sink the тpo，which，indeed，in Classical Greek is merged in the proper signifi－ cation of the word ；but this is not permitted by 1 Pet．i．20．Xрıбтой троебvшо $\mu$ е́vov трd ката－

21．ôv dei oúpavdv $\mu \dot{c} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon} \varepsilon \in$ ．］The true sense of these words has been little understood by the Commentators，by their not perceiving that their purpose is to anticipate a possible objection，that If Jesus had been the Messiah，he would have continued on earth，at least after his resurrection， and then founded his kingdom．To which the Apostle indirectly replies that it was necessary


$p^{\text {Deut } 18 .}$
intr．7．77．

9 Gen 12 et 28.12 $\xrightarrow{c}$ Remise









 $\mu a \tau i ́ ~ \sigma o v ~ \dot{\varepsilon} v \in \nu \lambda o \gamma \eta \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma o \nu \tau a \iota ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma a \iota ~ a i ~ \pi a \tau \rho ı a i ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$
（òei being for àèf，as Cecum．saw）for the pro－ sent that he should abide in Heaven，there to remain till the time of restoration，i．e．that heaven should have him，and not earth．The form of expression seems to be a popular one．And $\delta \dot{\varepsilon} \xi$ ．， as the best Commentators have seen，must mean occupare，not accipere．See Recons．Synop．It was necessary for the various purposes mentioned by our Lord in his discourses to the Apostles just before his crucifixion，Joh．xvi． $17 \& 18$.
21．dxокатaбt．］This word（which properly signifies a restoration of any thing to some former state，and，by implication，for the better）is capable of several interpretations，according to the view taken of the foregoing verse，whether as referred to Christ＇s advent at the destruction of Jerusalem，or at his Millenian reign，or at the end of the world．The list is untenable．And the 3 d ，by which it would denote the consumma－ tion of al things at the end of the world，when the inequalities of things in this present state will be adjusted，cannot well be admitted．The ${ }^{2}$ d seems alone the true view．
22．M Moñs－elTrev \＆cc．］At these words many Commentators have stumbled．The recent ones are generally of opinion that this passage of Deut．xviii． $15 \& 19$ ．does not refer to the Mes－ siah，and that Moses did not so mean it．See Kin．But，（as I have observed in Recess． Synop．）their reasons fall short of conviction； and as it is so evident that the Apostle does，（as also St．Stephen at vii．37．）regard the passage as having reference to Christ，we are bound to admit it．Schoetty．well observes，that this may be proved from Moses＇saying that＇$a$ Prophet must be raised like unto himself；＇i．e．such as should be the author and minister of a new cove－ nant，as Moses was of the old，the future abo－ lition of which is so clearly shown in the in－ pressie words of Jeremiah．＂Since therefore （continues he）the new Dispensation was to be established，it was necessary that the promised Prophet should，like Moses，confer much with God；and this our Messiah，who was emphati－ calls＇in the bosom of his Father，did．In all respects，then，He was like unto Moses．＂See the able parallel between Moses and Christ in Townsend＇s Chr ii．30．If the above view be correct，it will appear that Moses could not mean，as those Commentators would have us
suppose，the prophets of the Old Testament； and it would be yet harsher（not to say ire－ verent）to suppose both intended．The passage in question is not strictly a quotation，since it differs not a little from the Hebrew and the LXX．，but gives the substance of the sense there expressed．
23．$\langle\xi 0 \lambda o \theta \rho$ ．］A word confined to the Sept． and later writers．
24．ォáyees］i．e．in a limited sense，a very considerable part．This，as Doddr．remarks，is quite sufficient．Kal－ok，quinetiam．＇E入a入y－ gay，＇have spoken，＇i．e．prophetically ；for，as Kuin．observes，$\lambda a \lambda$ kiev is a vox sol．de hat re． Thus Acts xxvi．22．Heb．i．1． 2 Pet．i．21．On the construction of the Genit．belonging to on Jot， but coming before it，I have in Recens．Synop． adduced two examples from Aristoph．Plat．
 ÉXEL．and Eurip．Med．v．476．wis $\boldsymbol{i} \sigma \alpha \sigma \angle \nu, ~ ' E \lambda-$



25．viol $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \circ \phi$ ．］i．e．as the best Com－ mentators explain，＇ye are the disciples of the prophets，have been taught these things by them．＇ Prophets and teachers were by the Jews styled fathers，and their disciples their sons．See Note on Matt．xii．27．Kail न is dca日ウiкпs，i．e．＇ye are the heirs by the covenant，＇to you these advan－ tales pertain by the covenant，and therefore to you the offer of salvation is first made．The expression is formed on a Hebraic idiom of 12.
 a signification which may be found in the LXX．， and perhaps in the N．T．，but not necessary to be resorted to here．The citation is made with some small variation from the Hebrew and LXX． The Apostle means to affirm the same thing as St．Paul，Gal．iii．16．，that by the Messiah，as the descendant of Abraham，shall all nations be blessed．Indeed，matpıal tits $\gamma$ is might mean the tribes of Judæa．And such is the sense of xarpıa in the Classical writers．See my Note on Thucyd．iii．65．No．14．But in the Sept．it sometimes means nation．＇ $\mathbf{E} \nu$ before $\tau \bar{\varphi}, \sigma \pi \in \rho \rho \mu$ ． is found in all the earliest Editions，as also some Versions and Fathers，and has been received by almost every Editor from Beng．and Wets．down－ wards．



 oav aúroís oi iepeis каi $\dot{o}$ otpatทroòs roû iepoû кai oi











 will become clearer by supplying，what seems to be omitted，by an idiom frequent in the Scrip； tural writers，the particle oïv，＇Now unto you，＇ or，＇Unto you，then，＇which very apdy intro－ duces the conclusion of the discourse．＇$Y_{\mu i v}$ may be taken（as some direct）for a Dat．com－ modi，and xpeitov signify especially；but the physical sense is preferable，and is required by the preceding verse．Eùloyoüvтa ímās the In－ terpreters render＇in order to bless you．＇But this supposes a harnh idiom；and it is better to take eudor．as in apposition，or for wis evinoy． ＇as a blesser of you，＇one who should bless and make you happy．
 here thought to be an ambiguity of interpreta－ tion，since dтoorp．may be taken either in a transitive or in an intransitive sense．The former is adopted by the generality of Translators and Commentators，and may be defended．But as it occasions some harshness of construction，and in－ volves something objectionable in sense，（unless action be taken for intention，）the latter view （which is supported by the most eminent antient and modern Interpreters）is preferable．And iv tộ may be taken for cis $\tau \delta \nu$ denoting purpase； or，what is better，be taken for d $\pi l$ ，＇on every one of you turning from his iniquities，＇i．e．If every one shall turn．This，as the Commenta－ tors remark，is confirmed by the words of $\mathbf{v} .19$.
 ported by Is．i．16．（which the Apostle seems to have had in mind）Mávaate dud rêy movn－
 sages．

IV．1．גт̇órnoay aùrois］＇supervenerunt illis．＇The word properly signifies＇to be pre－ sented to the view of any one，＇in which is in－ herent some notion of suddenness，which occa－ sionally，as here，and in Lu．xx．1．，and else－ where，implies an idea of hostility．On $\dot{o}$ orpariyde toù iepoũ，see Note on Lu．xxii． 4.
 be wearied out ；2．as here，to feel aggrieved， vexed，bear with impatience，a sense found in the LXX．，but not in the Classical writers．Dıa To dióácxev a．Tdv $\lambda a d \nu$ refers to the Priests；
 ＇ $\mathrm{E} \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \mathrm{T}^{-1}$＇I $\eta \sigma$. by or in ，i．e．by the example of Jesus，as exemplified in Jesus．
 may here mean the custody of certain persons to take charge of them．But the common inter－ pretation a prison is best founded，and is esta－ blished beyond doubt by Y．18．ढ̈tevto autour dy тпр the later writers；for in the passage cited by the Commentators from Thucyd．vii．86．the sense is keoping in custody，as，indeed，is shown by the use of the Article，and the primitive sense of the word，as of the Latin custodia，which came in process of time to denote carcer．
4．è evuri $\theta_{\eta}-\chi^{\text {d．}}$ ．wévre］The Commentators are not agreed whether this number is inclusive of the 3000 before converted，or exclusive of it． But no persons thoroughly conversant in the idiom of the Greek language will fail to perceive that the former is the sense intended．＇Eyevvi＇⿴囗十n sipnifies uas become，a signification of Yiץvafoad which often occurs in the N．T．and LXX． ＇Avdowy，not men，but persons，it being put for divopércoy，as Lu．xi．31．James i．20．Acts vi． 11．et al．This is clear，because it stands for persons believing，тwiv nworevodurcop taken from the preceding．
5．au่TĒv］scil．Tciv＇Iowdaiøv，to be supplied from the context，or the subject matter．By roùs ${ }^{\circ} \rho x$ ．\＆c．are denoted the Sanhedrim．Bis ＇Iep．，＇at，＇or as some render，＇in Jerusalem．＇
6．＇Ex $\gamma$ évous d $\rho \mathrm{X}$ ．］i．e．as some think，the ehiefs of the 24 Sacesdotal classes ；or，as others， the kindred of those who had lately served the office of High Priest．
 the sense we must ascertain the scope of the question．Now imou＇jacte тойтo might refer，
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as some maintain，to the general conduct of the Apostles in their ministry．But from v．9．it is plain that it refers to the miraculous cure lately performed．＇Ev тоị буо́мать further illustrate the sense．The name of a person is often put for the person himself；but as it is certain that the Jews believed very wonderful works，even miracles to be performed by magic arts and incantation，i．e．invoking the names of certain angels or illustrious Patriarchs，the full sense of ӧуома may here be retained．
8．т $\lambda_{\eta \sigma \theta \epsilon l s} \pi \nu \epsilon \bar{v} \mu$ ．a $\gamma$ ．］＇filled with the influence and inspiration of the Holy Ghost．＇
 to examination．＇＇Avakpivec⿴囗十介 is a forensic term signifying to examine by interrogation．See Note on Lu．xiii．14．Eiepyeoia d $\theta \theta \rho \dot{\rho}$
 which use of the Genitive of object see Recens． Synop．At iv rivi sub．，not трóтфя，（as some do）but ò о́мать．Comp．v． $7 \& 10$ ．

11．оüтós dotin－ywilas］See Note on Matt． xxi． 42.
－oúx Ë́rrц－i $\sigma$ wrnpia］Many Commenta－ tors，from Whitby downwards，have argued from the context that in owrnpia must mean＇this healing，＇and $\sigma \omega \theta \bar{\eta} \nu a l$＇to be restored to health；＇ a sense which is found elsewhere；but，as Doddr． and others rightly maintain，it cannot be admitted here，though the reasoning they employ is partly inconclusive．The true reason，I apprehend，why that sense of ow日 $\bar{\eta} v a l$ cannot be admitted is， that it cannot have any sense varying from that
 withstanding what the first mentioned Commen－ tators may say，cannot have the sense in question， the healing，because that signification of the word is found no where else in the Scriptures， nor，I believe，in the Classical writers．And there is nothing to compel us to adopt it here， but much reason why we should not．The use of the Article does not，because＇the healing［in question］＇yields an inapposite sense．And the sease＇such a healing＇（assigned by Wakef．and eaters）cannot be shown to be inherent in the A－ticte．Indeed there is no proof that the

Article is here meant to exert any force，much less to be emphatic．I know of no passage in the N．T．，where such a sense can be with cer－ tainty proved，but several where the noun is used in its most abstract sense；in which case the force of the Article is merged in that of the
 ＇Iovdaiwn éनri．Rom．xi．11．गे бwrmpia тоis


 mrô Oce．In short，it is plain that if there were even an emphasis in the Article，the sense would be＇this mode of salvation，＇［namely，by the Gospel which we preach］not，＂this heal－ ing．＇．There is something to countenance this in xiii．26．where，in a similar address to the Jews，Paul seys ijuĩ ó dóyos тîs owornoias тaúvฑs बंлеотàn ；in which passage some MISS． and Versions omit the Article．At the same time I am ready to admit that there may be， not indeed that mixture of the physical and moral senses which Kypke and Heinrichs sup－ pose，but an allusion to the former couched under the latter．This is countenanced by the use of övopa just after，on which see Note on v． 7.

12．Td dedonévov］Said to be for $\%$ סisoras． But there is rather an ellip．of kara，quod attinet ad．$\Delta \in \mathbb{I}$ here signifies licet，permissum
 $\left.{ }^{1} \rho \gamma{ }^{\prime}\right\}$ ec $\theta a l$ ，and sometimes in the Classical writers．

13．ката入аßó $\kappa$ vot］＇having perceived，＇or learnt．This sense of кaraлa $\mu \beta{ }^{\prime} \nu \infty$ occurs in
 unlettered，ignorant of or but slightly versed in that kind of knowledge which the Jews alone prized，namely，of the Scriptures as explained by their Rabbinical interpreters．As to loceñat， I have in Recens．Synop．fully proved that it means private and plebeian persons，as opposed to those of rank or station．＇Excyiveo． ＇recognized，＇as in Matt．xiv．35．इivv＇Invoū ทंซay．The sense is，＇that they had been Jesus＇ companions and inherents．＇

















 iáбews．

## 

16 бvvíßa入ov］Sub．ßou入éúpara，expressed in Eurip．Phoen．700，or $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\nu \dot{\omega} \mu \eta \nu \text { ，expressed in }}$ Plutarch ii．592．（Kypke．）
 т $\bar{a} \gamma_{\mu} a$, i．e．the Christian doctrine．Dıavé－ mertat signifies to be distributed among several， and，as used of a report，to be spread abroad． By $\lambda_{\text {ajo }}$ is meant the people at large，as opposed to the Priests，Pharisees，and higher clasees． ＇Exi rẹ dуónaтı тoúrب̣ signifies＇in the name of this person，＇i．e．Jesis，who is（as Kuin．ob－ cerves）omitted by contempt．

 rendered＇they interdicted to them the speaking．＇ $\Delta i o \dot{\alpha} \sigma x \in t y$ is exegetical of $\phi \theta \dot{i} \gamma \gamma$ ．Katólov is for тара́тау．A similar use of каӨо́入ou $\mu \dot{\eta}$ occurs in Ezr．xiii． 3 \＆ 22 ．xvii． 14.
19．Ci díkatov \＆cc．］Of this sentiment see several examples from the Classical writers in Recens．Synop．One must here suffice，where Plato makes Socrates similarly address his judges：теібораи т
20．ou juvaje 0 a］The impossibility is a moral one，q．d．＇We cannot consistently with what is right and just；＇or，＇we cannot bring ourselves to do it．＇So Papinian cited by Wets．，＇nam quæ facta ledunt pietatem，nec facere nus posse credendum est．＇This，it may be noticed，is one of those few paseages in which the ordinary rule that two negatives strengthen the negation is not observed．See Matth．Gr．Gr． 601 ． Buttm．Gr．p．261．and Win．Gr．p．159．，who account for it on the principle that the negatives belong to two different rerbs．But，in a case like the present，that explains nothing．It is better to say that the two negatives belong，strictly
speaking，to two different clauses，and are sus－ pended on finite verbs，or Infinitives，either er－ pressed or understood，as in ovideis（sub．íart） örts ou moinget．In a case where an Infini－ tive occurs，the Infin．depends upon ẅनre，or els od understood．The antient Syriac trans－ lator accurately expresses the two clauses by ren－ dering，＇We have not power，that we should not speak what we have seen and heard．＇The $\eta \mu$ ins just before is very emphatic，q．d．＇As for ourselves，＇\＆c．
 is here an anomaly in construction，in discussing which the Commentators differ．Some think there is an ellipse of aitcoy，which is expressed in Lu．xxiii．14．Others avoid the ellip．by taking $\mu \eta \delta \partial \nu$ for $\mu \bar{\eta}$ ，and $\pi \omega \bar{s}$ for $\ddot{0} \pi \omega \boldsymbol{c o s}$ ，regard－ ing the $\tau d$ as only indicating the following sen－ tence，and consequently pleonastic．But it is better to admit an ellip．，though not of aitcoy， but the usual grammatical one of $x \rho^{\alpha} \gamma \mu a$ in the sense method（as we say，＇finding nothing would $\mathrm{do}^{\prime}$ ）．Thus the words following $\tau \delta \pi \bar{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ ，\＆ C 。 may be considered as exegetical and further evolving the sense．But the $\pi$ coss is not（as some suppose）in appasition with $\mu \eta \delta \& \nu$ ，but depends upon кaт $\alpha$ or cis understood．Nor does the $\boldsymbol{\tau} \delta$ belong to the $\pi \omega \mathbf{\omega}$ ，but to the whole sentence following；and $\tau \boldsymbol{d} \boldsymbol{\pi} \bar{\omega} s$－aürous form gram－ matically a separate clause．$\Delta \iota a \dot{\tau} \dot{\partial} \nu \bar{\lambda} \lambda a \dot{\partial} y$ be－ long（there being a transposition）to dimèuซa山 aíroús．

23．Tous Lioious］．The sense seems to be ＇their associates，＇i．e．the other Apostles and the disciples at large；as Acts xxiv．23．Joh． xv．19．and sometimes in the Classical wri－ ters．
















24-30. On this passage, Bp. Jebb (Sacr. Lit. p. 132. seqq.) remarks, "that this noble supplicatory hymn, poured forth at once by the whole Christian people, under the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit, is worthy of that inspiration from whence it flowed. No one part of it can be deemed inferior to another; the same sacred view of poetry animates the whole; and yet, amidst all this poetic fervour, we may discover much technical nicety of construction." To this 1 entirely assent, except as to regarding it as Poetry, and discerning poetic fervour, mucb less technical nicety of construction. The learned Prelate well remarks that vv. 27 \& 28 . (which is made the second stanza) form a prophetical quotation of lya $\tau i$-aíroü. The learned Prelate very rightly refers the $\gamma{ }^{\alpha} \rho$ to a clause left to be understood, q.d. This prophecy is now fulfilled, for of a truth, \&c. Thus the verses are not, as some imagine, parenthetical.
 for the Lord of the universe, with which Wets. compares Joseph. Ant. iv. 3, 2. பéбォота та̄̀
 the prayer of Hezekiah, Isa. xxxvii. 16-20. Here $\overline{\text { Is }}$ is to be supplied. In dф $\rho \dot{v} a \xi a v$ the metaphor is taken from the snorting, and other sounds of impatience and rage, emitted by horses. I would render, ' Why have the heathen raged.' Of кal $\dot{\dot{\epsilon}} \mu \in \lambda \dot{\text { ét. }}$. кevà the sense is ' and have formed vain plans.' So a proverb cited by Wets. кєעa кevol入oyi\}ovtat.
26. mapéoтnoav $\mid$ Not, as Kuin. imagines, for $\alpha \nu \theta \in \sigma \tau \eta \kappa e \sigma a \nu$. The sense (as the parallelism requires) is, 'they stood side by side for mutual help,' i.e. they banded together. Of this many examples may be seen in Steph. Thes. 4599. Eq.
27. $\sigma v \nu \dot{\chi} \boldsymbol{\theta}^{\theta} \eta \sigma a \nu \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho \& \mathrm{c}$.] Here, as Bp . Jebb observes, the heathen, the peoples, the kings of the earth, and the rulers, that is, all the rebelious personages of the second Psalm, are brought forward, as fulfilling whatsoever it was pre-appointed they should do. The equivalent terms in the prophecy and the declaration of its ful-
filment correspond-the Rulers, to Herod-the kings of the earth, to Pontius Pilate the heathen, to the heathen-the peoples, to the peoples of Israel-the Lord (Jehovah) to the holy child Jesus-the Lord's anointed, to " Whom thon hast anointed." From this last parallel the learned Prelate elaborately shows that the holy child Jesus is identified with Jehovah of the second Psalm, and skilfully removes the objections which might occur on a superficial view of the passage, by referring to Psalm xiv. "Thy throne, O God, endureth for ever," and showing that the passages under consideration, and all such like, afford mutual light and support. And be most truly observes that let but the doctrine of the $\theta$ edut pcosos be kept in view, and all objections must vanish.
I have not ventured to follow several eminent Editors in introducing into the text (from many MSS., Versions, and Fathers) the words iv Ti. тóגei rdurp, not so much because, as Bp. Jebb remarks, they have no equivalent in the prophecy, as because it is very difficult to account for their omission, but easy for their addition. they having every appearance of a marginal gloss.
The plural $\lambda a o i s$ is put for the singular $\boldsymbol{\lambda} a \bar{e}$, for more exact correspondence.
 purpose of doing-what? why no other than what thy overruling power and predisposing wisdom predetermined to be done.'
29. The verse is thus ably paraphrased by Bp. Jebb: 'And, as thy wise counsel pre-determined that, through the confederacy of Jews and Gentiles, of kings and rulers, Christ should suffer; so let the same wise counsel be now made conspicuous, in the undaunted preaching of Christ crucified.' At $\tau \alpha^{\prime} \nu \bar{\nu} \varphi$ sub. кaт $\alpha^{\prime}$ and
 their threats as to ward off their execution.
 art stretching forth thine hand (i. e. exerting thy power) for healing, and while signs and wonders are performing ;' for $\dot{d} \nu \tau \bar{\varphi}$ must be repeated.
 $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \alpha \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \theta_{\eta} \dot{\dot{o}}$ то́тоs $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\varphi} \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \quad \sigma \nu \nu \eta \gamma \mu \in ́ v o i \cdot$ каі $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \sigma \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$
 $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{\alpha} \pi a \dot{\rho} \rho{ }^{\prime} \eta \sigma i a s$.














31. тveímaros ai iov] The interpretation of some recent Commentators 'filled with sacred ardour' is a mere l'nitarian gloss. let we need not, and if the propriety of the Article be considered, we must not, take wv. in its personal sense, with Doddr. and Benson; but suppose. with Bp. Middlet., that it denotes the influence of the Holy Spirit, as communicating special and eminent gifts. It may be added that a sensible illapse is implied.
 tion of close amity, as in Plutarch: $\Delta \dot{v} o ~ \phi i \lambda o l$, $\psi u x{ }^{\prime} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{i}_{a}$. See other examples in Recens synop. Oín éleyev idoov, 'did not cull them his own,' or allege that as a reason why his poor brethren were not to be assisted therewith. This shows that they were really considered as their own; and consequently that the expresion nosva in the words following must be taken with limitation, i. e. that they were common, not by possession, but by use. See Note supra ii. 45.
33. Meүain! $\delta \cup \nu$.$] Wolf, Heinr. and Kuin.$ think the expression is to be understood only of the power of the Apostles' eloquence, \&cc. But although I would not exclude the force of that inartificial, but impressive, cloquence, which, founded in conviction, and supported by the visible efferts of Divine favour, would give their words an effect rarely to be found in the most polished oratory; yet I must maintain, that there is comprehended in the expression, what would, above every thing else, enable them to speak with such effect, namely, the miracles which they were occasionally enabled to work.

- Xúpıs re-aúroús] Many Commentators understand $x$ ápts of the favour of God. But the more eminent have been always of opinion, that it has reference to the Jeurish people, q. d. "the favour of the people rested upon them." This
is strongly confirmed by the context and by a similar phrase at v. 5.

34. ö́rol- نंxท̂jxov] Not, 'as many as had,' but, 'such as had,'i. e. some of those who had; for öfot is here and often put indefinitely. See also v. 4. Kтíropes, proprietors. Tı日éval тарà is not merely (as kuin. imagines) a phrase signifying to commit to the care of, but also implies the reverence with which the deposit was made. See Heliodor. cited by, the Commentators. Tas timas, 'the values,' with reference to the number of the farms, \&rc. sold. This sense of $\tau \iota \mu \eta$ is confined to the middle and later Grecism.
35. Aevitys] Suffice it here to say, that though the Levites had, as a tribe, no inheritance, yet they were allowed individually to hold landed property. To x $\bar{\eta} \mu a$, the price, the money; a sense almost confined to the plural, though two examples of the singular are adduced, to which I have, in Recens. Synop., added another.
V. After the undissembled liberality of Barnabas is recorded an example of the contrary in the case of Ananias and Sapphira, and its termination in sudden death. The nature of this crime has been by some misconceived, and by others unreasonably magnified; but, at the most moderate estimate, it must he regarded, even on principles of natural religion, as a crime of no ordinary magnitude, and such as might well merit the punishment with which it was visited, and which was more especially recessary in the then state of things, to prevent the Christian religion from being discredited by the impositions of worldly-minded profensors.
36. ivooфíбато $\alpha \pi \delta$ тทis т.] Sub. mépos, 'appropriated part to his own use.' Such is the force of the middle verb. Nooфiکco日al signifies to set apart to one's own use, to embersle.











2．$\sigma v y e i \delta v i a s]$ Sub．toùto．The ellipse is supplied in Thucyd．Vol．in．92．7．Bek．छuvet－
 Commentators esteem the crime sacrilege，which was punishable with death ：but Mede well dis－ tinguishes between the species facti，and the circumstantic facti，namely，hypocrisy，desire of vain glory，\＆c．This last was perhaps the pre－ ponderating motive which tempted them to the offence．
3．$\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \rho \omega \sigma \epsilon \epsilon-\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \kappa a \rho \delta i a \nu$ vou］The best Commentators account this as a Hebrew phrase， denoting to incite，impel．See Eccles．viii．11．As to the force of the whole phrase，most recent Com－ mentators，comparing it with that at v．4．Eौoov iv
 no more than＇why was thy heart filled with that diabolical plan？＇But this is unjustifiably sink－ ing the personality of Satan，and his power as well as will to suggest evil thoughts to the minds of men．The two expressions above mentioned are by no means inconsistent；for while the assaults of Satan incite men to sin，their own natural corruption is sufficient of itself to suggest evil thoughts．Nor will there be any thing diff－ cult in the interrogation dıati \＆cc．，if we consider that the full force of $\varepsilon \pi \lambda$ ípwore tiv кароíay， which is $\pi \lambda \eta \rho \circ$ форе $\bar{\sigma} \theta a t$ ，implies（as we know Satan＇s power is limited）such a yrelding to the temptation as，while it argues the free agency of man，makes him at the same time strictly ac－ countable．Uev́raftac signifies to attempt to deceive by a lie；the attempt being，as often， put for the performance．This offence towards the Apostles involved the same crime towards the Holy Spirit，by whose inspiration they acted．
 meant＇remained unsold．＇The particip．is to be resolved into a verb and participle．Eol，＇at thy disposal．＇A dativus commodi．At $\tau t$＇ö $\tau \iota$
 kapdiap signifies to deliberately plan and deter－ mine on any thing．So the Classical d $\nu \quad \theta \nu \mu \bar{\circ}$ $\beta \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ．
 this verse with the preceding one［where Ananias is said to have lied against the Holy Ghost］as well as several other passages［Joh．iii．6．com－ pared with 1 Joh．v．4．Matt．ix．38．compared with Acts xiii．4． 2 Tim．iii．16．with 2 Pet．i． 21 ． Joh．vi．45．with 1 Cor．ii．13． 1 Cor．iii．16．seqq． with 1 Cor．vi．19．］Theologians have in all ages inferred that the Holy Ghost is God．Wets． Indeed，has remarked that o $\theta$ eds with the Article
is always confined to God the Father．I have． however，already shown that no such distinction is observed：$\dot{\delta}$ Өeds and $\theta e \dot{o}$ s being used indi－ criminately，except where grammatical rales in－ terfere．See the excellent note of Whitby．
The ouk－$d \lambda \lambda a$ is by most recent Commen－ tators rendered non tam－quam；which，bow－ ever，is not very necessary，and the principle itself is impugned by Winer Gr．Gr．p． 158. Perhaps，however，où may here be taken for oi $\mu$ óvov，as in Thucyd．iii．45．where see my Note，and also iv．92．where see Duker．As to the syntax of $\dot{\xi} \psi \in \dot{v} \sigma \infty, \mathrm{Bp}$ ．Middl．thinks it strange that it should here be used with the Dative，while in the preceding verse it is ased with the Accus．He seems to think there is no other instance of the syntax with the Dative． Yet there may be such．But the learned Prelate is wrong in regarding the Dat．as put for the Accus．It is，I conceive，put for the Genit．with кacá，which gields a much stronger sense，and hence was used in a connexion which requared something stronger．Examples of 廿eideota kará rıvos and кaтa廿evid．tuvos may be seen in Steph．Thes．and Wetstein＇s Note on 1 Cor． xv． 15.
 ciousness of Ananias＇s offence see Wets．ap． Recens．Synop，and on the justice of his punishment，Limborch，Biscoe，and Doddr． ibidem．The Rationalists，indeed，defend the Apostle from the charge of excessive severity－ by maintaining（alas for the credulous incredulity of scepticism？）that Ananias and Sapphira died not by a Divine judgment，but of fright！！As if it were likely that so very rare an occurrence should have happened to two persons at once． And that the Apostle did not threaten nor even allude to Ananias＇s death，is nothing to the purpose，and admits of being satisfactorily ac－ counted for．See Recens．Synop．
 and supposed by Hamm．，Mosheim，Heinrichs， and Kuin．to have been Church officens（like our Sacristans）appointed to perform various duties，such as sweeping and cleaning the Church，preparing for the Lord＇s Supper and the agapm．This is，they think，confirmed by ขé⿱亠乂，$\sigma \times 0$ denoting in Alexandrian Greek ser－ vants，and is countenanced by the use of the Article．Mosheim，however，adduces no proofs of the existence of such officers，at so very early a period；though one might have expected some allusions at least to them in the words of the










 tov̀s axovóvtas taûta.



Apostolical Fathers. There is, then, no suficlient reason to forsake the common interpretston, which supposes oi veay. to mean 'the younger part of the men present.' And thus the Article has great propriety. It seems to have been usual for the younger men of the Christian Church to perform, perhaps in rotation, the more laborious offices in the congregation; which were at so early a period not yet appropriated to particular persons, and consequently those persona were not likely to have any disunitive name of office. इuydoreanay, for weptéoreliay, 'wound him up,' namely, either in a winding sheet laid up in the place, or perhaps, in the present emergency, only in a cloak. This sense of ovaredicty is very rare, and the Commentators adduce only one example, to which I have added another in Recess. Synop. Burial on the same day was (and still is) usual in the East ; and I have in Recess. Synop. proved that the custom was not unknown among the Greeks of the earliest ages, probably introduced by the Cadmo-Phoenician colony.
 next Prayer-time.
 doric, to sell. The Latin vendo is properly renum do; and our all is from the Avg. Sax. syllan, to let go, deliver up. But there is not, as Ruin. imagines, in the use of the $d^{2} \pi d$ any reference to the money to be received as the price,
 only denotes to give up or away; just as does sylvan. The idea sell is too complex to be fully expressed by any single word. Hones signifies literally to turn over io another, (from modes, to turn) and thus to sell. The Hebrew term propertly denotes to deliver up; as in many passages. See Gesenius. Thus the compere, of the Latin, and the caup-yan, caeqp-an, and koop-en, of the Northern languages signify to take to oneself, to buy; and the German ver-kaufen, the contrary, namely, to give up to another, to sell.

- ToGoutov] Bornemann maintains that this should be rendered, not fanti, but towntillo. The gene, however, is ' for such a sum as your husband rays.'

9. тecpdбaı td $\pi v e \bar{u} \mu a \kappa$.] i. e. to try whether
the Spirit of God would detect your hypocrisy and fraud.

- ot móses т今̈̀ $\theta a \psi$. $]$ The Commentators regard this as a Hebraism for oi $\theta \dot{\text { qu }}$ qayres ; the Hebrews often expressing a man by some member of his body instrumental to the action in queston. I have, however, shown at large in Recess. Synop., by references to Eurip. Hip. 657. Crest. 1205. Suppl. 90, and Here. Fur., that this idiom was found among the Greek Classical writers, but that it is confined to the Ports. Kal dEotroval oe. This does not contain a threat, much less (as Porphyry represents) an imprecation, but a prediction. It should therefore be rendered (with Newt. and Waken.) 'will carry thee out.' The same Holy Spirit which revealed to Peter the fraud, made known the punishment which would follow it.
 A common Hebraism.
 are few passages which present greater difficulties than this. There is an appearance of contradiction or, at least, discrepancy between some things here said; and such a seeming incoherence of the clauses respectively, that various expedients have been devised to adjust the passage; the mildest of which is by amending the order of the words. There is, too, such a connexion between
 $\pi \lambda a r e i a s$, that most Editors and Commentators
 sal ywvacxōy in a parenthesis. But, as Zeigler and Beck have shown, this is contrary to the laws of parenthesis. See Recens. Synop. And as the antients did not receive this parenthesis, there is the less reason to admit it. The sense, also, thus arising, is too feeble. Many recent Commentators seek to remove the difficulty by cancelling the whole passage. That, however, is cutting the knot, and the expedient has not the least countenance from MSS. or Versions. Now as it is better to heal than to amputate, we may view more favourably the attempts of others to make all right by a transposition of the clauses. Bp. Sherlock, A. Clarke, and Townsend transpose them thus:
v. 14. And believers were the more added G










to the Lord, multitudes both of men and women.

12. And they were all with one accord in Solomon's porch.
13. And of the rest durst no man join himself to them; but the people magnified them.
14. And by the hands of the Apostles were many signs and wonders wrought among the people.
15. Insomuch that they brought forth, \&c. \&cc.

But though transposition of vords, when near together, is, as Porson has remarked, the safest of all modes of [conjectural] emendation; a transposition of clauses remote from each other, and involving an inversion of the order in which they stand, cannot but be regarded as the most licentious and desperate kind of conjectural emendation; and when wholly unsupported by any evidence external or internal, it must not be resorted to even in the meanest Classical writer, much less in the Scriptures. And as the above method would involve a transposition of the most violent kind, it must not be thought of. lf, indeed, the passage had been so written at first, who can believe that it could have been transposed as we find it in all the MSS. and Versions! Wakefield adopts a transposition which is somewhat milder; but it requires conjectural alteration besides, to help it out. As to the Athiopic Version, on which Mr. Wakefield has here, as often, chosen to alter the text, the credit of the witness is, like his colour, not of the whitest hue. Insomuch that his evidence is never to be taken, unless when confirmed by that of a fuirer testimony. For my own part, I would rather regard the present passage as an example of Synchysis, and indeed not near so remarkable as several which might be adduced from Thucydides. I see nothing inexplicable in the passage as it stands. "ATavies denotes the whole body of the Christians; and the passage is of a similar kind to those at i. 11. ii. 1 \& 44. See also xii. 20. The sense in all of them is: ' they used to , meet together for worship.' And here \&v rи̣̂ बrộ̀ Io入. is added because, now that the believers were become so numerous, they could not any longer hold general assemblies for divine worship in the $\dot{\theta} \pi \in \rho \bar{\chi} \circ \boldsymbol{y}$, which they had been accustomed to occupy. The tīn $\lambda$ os $\pi \bar{\omega} \nu$ denotes, I conceive, the rest of the worshippers at the temple. These, it seems (who, no doubt, were mostly Pharisees), did not venture to approach (for infesuption or interference), but stood in awe of them, and kept aloof, because (as is just be-

dкov́ontas taüta. This interpretation of $\infty<\lambda \lambda$ $\bar{\alpha} \sigma \theta a t$ is confirmed by the Peshito Syriac Version, and (Ecumenius; and is placed beyood



At v. 13. 'Ad $\lambda$ ' $\dot{\varepsilon} \mu \boldsymbol{\gamma} d \lambda u d e v$ \&c. may be rendered, 'However, the people at large held them in great admiration.' The words mā̀ioy diyuyauciöy are quasi-parenthetica, and I have here pointed with Knapp. They may be readered: "Nay, there was rather an addition to the number of believers in the Lord,' or, 'And believers in the Lord were more and more added. multitudes both of men and women." The wort \&c. of the following verse seems to refer to the people at large, though it would not be inapplicable to the believers just before mentioned.
15. enl $\kappa \lambda$ aveñ kal кp.] Since the latter term denotes a small and mean couch for a singte person; the former, a larger and better sort, like our sofa; this may show that persons of a :.: classes alike resorted to the Apostles for aid.
 did this, whether Jews, or Christian believers. but it was probably both; and the approval a the action, which was a superstitious one (as implying that the power of healing was inherem: in the Apostles, and not, as it really was, adver. titious, and procured at their instance), is not to be inferred, even if it were true (which, however, is disputed by most Commentators) that the persons in question were healed; for tha: would be procured by their faith, without the intervention of the Apostles. However, from what is said in the next verse, compared with xix. 12., it seems (as Kuin. admits) highly probable that many, if not all the persons in question, were healed, at least where the faith was strong enough to merit that mercy. And in such a case the superstition would be forgiven, and the good intention accepted.
 $\lambda \in \infty \nu$ ]. The common version cannot be tolerated. since it silences the Article, and supposes a harsh ellipsis of dró. Render: 'The bulk of the population (or, as Wakef., 'the numerous inltabitants of') the surrounding cities flocked to Jerusalem.' At mépt $\xi$ there is an ellipse of $\kappa \in t \mu$ éviov or the like, common to all languages: though sometimes the complete expression occurs. 'OXA. See Note on the kindred phraseology at Lu.vi. 18. It is plain that the demoniacs are distinguished from the sick.
17. dyaoras] This is regarded by De Dien and Kuin. as a Hebrew pleonasm; while Casaub.














入ójous roútous on te iepeu's cai on otpatnjòs toû iepoû
 sail. ext toil yınopévoss. The latter view is preferable; but the term only suggests a notion, and that a faint one, of indignation. In the words following it is implied, though not expressly said, that the High Priest was a Sadducee. And that some of the High Priests (as well as most persons of high rank) were such, we learn from Josephus. Xiv aivrụ̄ seems to be for $\mu e \tau^{\circ}$ aìroü, denoting to be of any one's party. See iv. 13. and Note. Some, however, take it to denote those who were his colleagues in his official duties, of council with him. But as those could not be many, the mares seems to exclude that view. Alpeats denotes properly a taking up any thing, as a choice, or an opinion; 2. the opinion so taken up, 3. as here, the party maintaining is, in which sense it often occurs in the later Classical writers of the various philosophical sects. Zijnos here denotes a combind feeling of entry, malice, and wrath, on the cause of which see iv. 2. and Note. Z $\bar{\eta} \lambda$ os is not derived from Yew and Xian; as Mr. Valpy supposes. It is manifest that $\lambda o s$ is a mere termination, of which there are numerous examples. The $\eta$, as in $\beta \eta \lambda o s, \beta \epsilon \in \beta \eta \lambda o s$, and many other words, is formed by crasis from the vowel of the root and the of the termination; for the real
 \&cc., which seem to have been at first exclusively adjectival.
 headed them,' i.e. caused them to be appleheaded. 'Es tnpriarc ònuoolq for els Tip ठ $\eta \mu$., as supra iv. 18. where see Note. Wakef. wrongly renders, 'a common prison,' not aware that the absence of the Article is no proof that
 being often, as Middlet. has shown, vi. 1., anasthous. Though the learned Prelate does not easy in what cases or why they are so. It should seem that they are so when the substances designated are things of frequent use and having often to be mentioned. In such a case the

Article is omitted, because it may be readily understand; as in our own language perpetually.
19. $\dot{a} \gamma \gamma \boldsymbol{i}$ os $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \mathrm{K} u p i o u]$ Not the angel \&c., but an angel.
20. ara日èites $\lambda a \lambda$.] Beta and Kin. regard ora 0. as a Hebrew pleonasm, and Grot. thinks it has reference to constancy. But it appears to be a forensic term used of those who are set up to speak, either as orators and advocates, or as prisoners or persons pleading in defence of their own cause. See Acts xvii. 22. xxv. 18.
 religion which leads to salvation.' So Joh. vi.68.
 however, as Kuin. thinks, be an hypallage, as in Acts xiii. 26. Compare Rom. vii. 24. And this is supported by the Syriac Version.
21. ind $\tau \delta \nu \dot{\partial} \rho \theta \rho o \nu$ ] 'about day-break.' So
 Note on Thucyd. iii. 112. Tiny repouglay is supposed to have been added to explain to
 word, however, was so commonly in use with the Greeks, that it could need no explanation. It should rather seem that yepougia $\nu$ is added because the term was not infrequently applied to the Sanhedrin, and so it occurs in Philo and Josephus, though it is also used by Dionys. Hal. to express the Latin Senatus; both appellations derived in a similar way with our aldermen.
23. iv $\pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \eta \dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi$.] for $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu \pi \dot{d} \sigma \eta$ di $\sigma \phi . j$ ad-
 is omitted in many MSS., Versions, and early Fid., and is cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. downwards. But we may better account for its omission than for its insertion, since, as Kuin. truly observes, " soleat a scriptoribus Graces et Latinis multis verbis alia audi, quibus wis superiorum vv. magis declaretur." "Such words are often omitted by careless scribes, or canceller by half-learned Critics.
24. $\dot{\text { i lepevis] Taken Kat' devin for the }}$ High Priest, as in Heb. v. 6. and sometimes in the Sept. and Josephus. Ry the of dipl. are















meant the 24 chiefs of the sacerdotal classes. See Note on Matth. ii. 4. On $\sigma \tau \rho \alpha \tau \eta \gamma \delta s$ roü lepoù see Note on iv. 1. Tl áv yevocto T. On the sense of these words Commentators are not agreed. Many render 'quonam hoc evasurum esset;' others, ' quomodo hoc factum fuerit.' But no proof has been adduced that such a sense is contained in the words: which are, I conceive, best rendered by Grot., Wets., and Valckn., 'quid hoc esset rei,' and are a popular form of expression, importing, 'did not know what to think of 'it,' which is expressive of wonder at some circumstances connected with any thing, as, for instance, the means, manner, or event of any thing. So $x$. 17. $\begin{aligned} & \text { ı } \eta \pi o ́ \rho e t ~ \\ & i\end{aligned} \hat{a}_{\hat{\alpha} \nu}$

26. ${ }^{2} \nu a \mu \eta \lambda_{2} \theta_{\text {.] }}$ According to the punctuation and construction adopted by all the Fditors and Commentators, $Z_{\nu a \mu \eta} \lambda_{t} \theta_{\text {. is suspended on }}$ é $\phi o \beta o$ övro. But that involves an unprecedented harshness of syntax; фоßeiofac being often construed with $\mu \eta$, but never with $\% \nu a \mu \eta$. And though some MSS. omit the Iva, that is but cutting the knot, which may be untied by simply placing dфoß. $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \tau \delta \nu \nu a d \nu$ in a parenthesis.

 mate to mean 'respecting this person.' But d $\pi \mathrm{l}$ has never that sense in the N.T., nor, I believe, in the Classical writers. It is plain from many similar passages of the N.T. that $\pi \pi \pi$, must here denote ' resting on the authority of,' or 'by,' in which latter sense iv is more frequent, and sometimes no preposition is found, as Matt. vii. 22. Mark ix. 38. The recent Commentators generally take $\dot{\delta}$ ㅇó $\alpha a \tau \iota$ as here put per periphrasin for person. But though this may, in a popular view, be admitted, it is better to suppose $\dot{\boldsymbol{\nu} \delta \boldsymbol{\mu} \mu а т ь}$ to signify authority \&c., as often elsewhere; and roúco to be put, by a common hypallage, for toutov. This is required by a kindred passage at Acts iv. 7. iv


 may, as Pric. and Schoettg. think, be said con-
temptim; an idiom so common in all languages and all writers that examples might have been
 implied, in the Messiahship of the person in question, his unjust condemnation, and the accountableness of the chief priests for his being put to death.

- техлпршікате] Of this figurative sense of $\pi \lambda \eta \rho o \omega_{\infty}$ examples are adduced by Wets. The force of tmayayeiv is, well illustrated by Elsn. and Kuin. Indeed $\dot{d} \pi d \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ ety $\dot{d \pi}!$ rwa is a phrase denoting to bring any thing (always something evil) upon a person; and it is used in Demosth. and often in the later writers.

29. einov] i. e. through the medium of Peter; as is suggested by the use of droxpoteis, not dंтокрเөévтes. Thus Kuin. observes, that "" in the Gaspels, too, that is ascribed to many which properly belongs only to one." See Matt. xv. 15. and Note. This, however, is not confined to the Scriptures, but occurs in the Classical writers. Thus in Thucyd. iii. 52. we have dre入өóvres êleyov rotade, though it is plain that the speech was delivered by one person.
 to the orders of those who are in the exercise of authority of any kind. On the sentiment, with which the Commentators compare several from the Classical writers see Note on iv. 19. The reason implied in the preference of obedience is the same as is suggested in a kindred passage of



 $\zeta=\sigma \theta a t$ in the middle form, used in a deponent sense, signifies to take a business in hand so as to despatch it. And then it is used in the sense to kill, by a metaphor common in our own language. This use is only found in the later writers. The
 tree, but a post, gibbet, cross, as x. 39. Gal. iii. 13 . The word properly signifies a sawn or hewn beam.
30. $\alpha \rho \chi \eta \gamma d \nu$ кal $\sigma \omega \pi \bar{\eta} \rho a]$ These words are in apposition with roürov, and may, with Kuin.,


 тоis reıӨapХoûбıv aúтû．








be regarded as put for els dipx．or els rd civat． But it is rather for as $\alpha \rho X$ ．；for though apposi－ tion is generally employed to supply something for the completion of a definition，it often con－ tains（as Matthix Gr．Gr．$\$ 433$ ．observes）not so much an explanation，or fuller determination of the former，as the design of it．To the ex－ amples of Matthise may be added one yet more appogite from Thucyd．i．138．dóvtos Baathécos


－סoüvaı \＆c．］．＇to be the means of producing repentance［by his doctrine，］and effecting re－ mission of sins by his all－atoning merits and blood．＇
 mentators take $\dot{\rho \eta \mu .}$ for mраүна́тшv，by He － braism，as referred to the things mentioned at vv． 30 \＆31．Others take $\dot{\rho} \eta \mu$ ．to denote the
 especially as the doctrines implied the things． Kal－$\delta d$ ，＇quin imo，nay too．＇At тоis тet日ap－ Xoüatv there is not（as Kuin．imagines）an ellipse of $\dot{i \mu i \varphi, ~ t h e ~ i \mu i y ~ b e i n g ~ s u p p r e s s e d ~ t h r o u g h ~}$ modesty．
33．dıeтрiorto］$\Delta$ catp．signifies properly to be sawn through．Here almost all the best Com－ mentators，antient and modern，are agreed that the sense is，＇were filled with fury，and as it were，gnashed their teeth；＇a metaphor taken from gnashing the teeth as one draus a saw．It was wrong in Doddr．and Wakef．to translate， ＇grinded or gnashed their teeth at them．＇For from the more fully worded expression at vii． 54 ． ঠıетріоито таîs карঠiats aüтज̈v，каl «ßpuXov тous dofortas＇dw＇aujidy，it is plain that there can only be a metaphor．After all，our common version＇were cut to the heart＇may be tolerated， if it be understood to represent the combined effects of being stung to the heart with the just reproaches cast at them，and being filled with rage and fury at their accusers．So Plautus Bacch．cited by Steph．Thes．in v：＂Heu cor meum finditur．Istius hominis ubi quoque fit mentio．＇Eßouncúorro，＇were deliberating，＇or， ＇were determining．＇

34．「ama $\left.\lambda_{1}{ }^{\prime} \lambda\right]$ A frequent name among the Jews，though the Commentators are pretty much agreed that this was the celebrated Gamaliel，son of Simon and grandson of Hillel，Paul＇s master．
by the people．＇Of this sense examples are ad－ duced by Wets．
 Wakef．should render：＇bade the Apostles to stay without a little while．＇Such cannot be the sense．There is no fault in our common version， except that the idiomatical eкeлevoe，which only means counselled，exhorted，is translated without any regard to，perhaps in forgetfulness of，that idiom；which is the more excusable，since it did not occur to one so conversant with the Classics as was Wakefield，though it is frequently found in Thucyd．and other of the best writers．＂E $\mathcal{E}$ rosin $\alpha t$ ，＇to remove，＇is used according to that idiom by which roceiv is employed with various
 by an ellipse of some verb of motion in the in－ finitive．See Elsn．and Kypke．
 mentators are agreed that the construction is，
 tois avep．T．Examples of this use of ext tive after т $\rho \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \in i p$, are adduced by Wets．＇Exil here signifies in the case of，concorning，as Joh． xii．16．Rev．$x$ ． 11.

36．Ocudas ］On the difficulty connected with this Theudas（which it does not belong to the plan of this work to discuss）see an ample con－ sideration and probable solution in Recens．Synop． Tıya，for $\mu$ é $\gamma a \nu$ ，by an idiom common to both antient and modern languages．Notwithstand－ ing the custom of Editors，it should seem that $T$ ts in this sense is wrongly made an enclitic． It ought to retain its accent，being too insigni－ ficant to either lose or incling its accent．For тробеко入入＇门 $\theta_{\eta}$ some few good MSS．and Versions have тробeк入i $\theta \eta$ ，which is preferred by Mor．， Hemsterh．，Valckn．，Schleus．，and Kuin．，as be－ ing too rare a word to have come from the scribes， and therefore changed into one more common． But the scribes rarely changed at all．The changes in the MSS．of the N．T．are chiefly from the antient Critics，who frequently alter common words to more elegant ones，but rery rarely the reverse．And when we consider that mpoбко $\lambda \bar{\alpha} \sigma \theta a t$ is of frequent occurrence both in the O．and N．T．（even in this Book，）and that rpoor $\begin{gathered}\text { iveo日at occurs not once，there can }\end{gathered}$ be little doubt but that жporeкरोi $\theta_{\eta}$ proceeded from the Alexandrian Critics，especially as it only occurs in six MSS．That the framers of
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the Versions read roogen $\lambda i \theta \eta$ is by no means certain ；for they may，as often，have translated liberally．

36．סte $\left.\lambda^{\prime} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu\right] \Delta t a \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \in \sigma \theta a t$ is often used of the disbauding of an army，or the dispersion of a multitude．「íveofac els oúòev is an Hellenistic phrase for $̈$ ŋ̈кety cis oùdèv．
 ＇Aréбтท⿱㇒日，＇drew away into insurrection；＇a signification frequent in the Classical writers from Herodot．downwards，but never，I believe，there used with ìni $\sigma \omega$ a⿱宀乇тoú after it．
38．тà vūv］Sub．övта and тра́үмата． ＇A for＇put them not to death，nor maltreat them．＇ This signification of the word does not，I believe， occur in the Classical writers．With the prasent passage Pric．compares a very similar one in


38．$\dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{T} \iota$＇$\dot{\alpha} \nu \dot{\nu}]$ On the sentiment see several kindred ones in Recens．Synop．
 have failed to perceive that this use of the Indic． here instead of the Subjunctive after el assumes the thing in question as certain．The full sense is，＇If it be，as it is；＇for there is a blending of two clauses．
 whether these words connect with $\dot{\epsilon} \dot{\sigma} \sigma a \tau e \& c$. ． as Pric．，Hamm．，Valckn．，and Markl．maintain， or whether there be（as Camer，，Beza，Grot．， and Kuin．suppose）an ellipse of ópäte．The latter is confirmed by the plena locutio at Lu． $x x i$ ．34．Yet the former is the more natural construction．
41．Xaipoyres］This is to be construed with
 Casaub．notices the elegant use of the figure

Oxymoron，which arises when two ideas，repar nant to each other are so joined as not to br really repugnant，but only to seem so．Of this examples are adduced by Wets．

It must be remarked，that though flagellation was employed both among the Jews and Romane for even small delinquencies，yet it was cos． sidered a most ignominious punishment．

42．кat＇oikov］．This，as it is opposed to ip tạ̄ iep $\overline{\text { an }}$ ，plainly signifies in pricate kouses ：car oikov being put in a generic sense for $\kappa \alpha \gamma^{\prime}$ oícovr． from house to house；for кatai here，perhap： exerts a distributive force；though it is not
 oाкоия．
 meant by these Hellenists，or Grecians，the Com－ mentators are not agreed．Some eminent moderns think they were Greek Proselytes to Judaism，and now converted to Christianity．But that view is liable to many objections，which are stated in Recens．Synop．It is better，with the greater part and the best of the Commentators，antient and modern，to suppose that they were foreigr Jeurs． whose residence was chiefly in Grecian cities． and who consequently ordinarily used the Greek language．See Recens．Synop，and Campbell＇s Disertation on this subject．It must，however， be acknowledged that the question hardly admits of being thoroughly settled，and all we can pre－ tend to know for certain is，that they were，in some sense，Jeus．The＇Eßpaios were the Jews of Palestine，who spoke what was then called the Hebrew，namely，the Syro－Chaldee．
－тapencespoüvтo］The word signifies，1．to look aside of，2．to overlook，neglect．IIapopáa is the term used by the best Classical writers； and xapa日copéco occurs，with one or two ex－ ceptions，entirely in the later ones．The fault of












the neglect in question rested，of course，with the guardians of the poor，who，it is commonly supposed，were persons appointed by the Apostles in rotation，or as it might be convenient to super－ intend the distribution of the funds for the poor． Most Commentators，however，have for a long time embraced the opinion of Mosheim in his Comm．de rebus Christianorum ante Constant． p． $118 \& 138$ ，that they were certain persons always the same，and all Hebrews，who had hitherto been appointed by the Apostles，but were now to be elected by the people，and that to them were to be added seven persons of the Hellenists．Mosheim and Kin．think that the whole body of the Jerusalemite Christians was divided into seven parties or families，for which there were as many places of public worship； and that hence also seven persons were elected for the purpose of taking care of the poor and of strangers，so that each family should chase one， and over each of the families one of those seven should be placed．St．Luke does not，indeed， give a particular account of this office，but only touches on the chief heads of early Ecclesiastical history，leaving his readers a most ample field for enlargement，reflection，and conjecture on what is by him so succinctly narrated．
2．outs dpectón dertul］＇It is not meet or proper；＇for by ipecrive the LXX．express the Heir． 1 ص and zw of the O．T．Tot 入órov qoü $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ oi，＂the preaching of the doctrines of the Gospel．＇Dtakoveiv t $\rho a \pi$ eras．The best Inter－ praters antient and modern are agreed that this phrase denotes，in general，the collection and distribution of the funds to be expended on the support of the poor．

3．$\dot{e \pi \iota \sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \psi ~} \downarrow \sigma \theta \epsilon$ ］The word properly denotes to look at，surrey，but here，from the adjunct，to look at for choice，to look out；a signification so rare，that not 2 single example has been adduced； Mapropoveívous，scil．civ．＇men of good repute．＇
 cense of $\pi \nu e \dot{j} \mu$ ．$d \gamma$ ．is exceedingly lowered by many recent foreign Commentators，who take it to denote a holy ardour ；though，on the other hand，it is pressed too far by many old Commen－ taters，who explain it of the faculty of working miracles．The maxim in medio tutisimus ibis will here，as often，hold good；for the expres－ sion must denote the being possessed of those higher gifts of the Holy Spirit，some of them
supernatural，which were，in the Apostolic age， vouchsafed to many Christians，and of which St． Paul treats in his Epistles；including，of course， the lower gifts，or rather graces of the Holy Spirit，so suitable to the situation of the persons in question．By ooфia seems to be denoted not so much divine wisdom，or knowledge of the Scriptures，as human and worldly knowledge， which was equally necessary for the proper dis－ charge of the office，namely，sound judgment， prudence，and knowledge of business．Kara－ orijoucy，for the common reading кaraori－ owuev，is found in many good MSS．，some Fathers and Versions，and nearly all the early Edd．；and is received by almost every Editor from Wets．downwards．Xpeías denotes bust－ ness of importance；of which sense several ex－ amples are adduced by the Commentators．
4．тробкарт．］See Note on i．14．By тро－ बevxī may be denoted not only prayer，but religious meditation and study as preparatory to the discharge of the ministerial duties just after－ wards mentioned．
5．グperev－$\pi \lambda_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime}$ aus］This is altogether a Hellenistic phrase，no where found in the Clas－ sical writers，but formed on the model of the Hebrew コンy．So Deut．1．23． 2 Sam．iii． 36. The Greeks would have said jpeoen navel to т $\lambda^{\prime} \boldsymbol{j}^{\prime} \in \epsilon$ ．（De Dieu \＆Valck．）
－тpuajinutov］On the absence of the Article before this word see Stewart ap．Win．Gr．Gr． p． 60.8 m ．He is，however，mistaken in what he says．IIporid．being closely connected with ＇Avi．，does not require the Article，and may very well signify a proselyte of Antioch．Besides， rooon＇入．does not signify office，station，or em－ ployment，and therefore does not require the Article．Had the Article been put，the pune－ tuation would have been tiv тробi $\lambda$. ．，Ave．， and it would have designated Nicolas as well known from the circumstance；which seems not to have been the case．
 Wolf rightly deduce the origin of laying on hands from the age of Moses，adverting both to the seven Seniores，on whom Moses laid his hands（Nom．xxvii．18．）and to Moses laying his hands on Joshua．Hence the custom was preserved in the Jewish Church，and thence introduced into the Christian．As laying on hands had always been used in praying for the














good of any person present, in order to show dєєктuкผิs for whom the benefit was entreated; so it was also from the earliest ages a rite of institution to offices, which it conferred by symbol.
 This statement appeared so improbable; that some have either taken refuge in conjecture, or adopted the reading of a few MSS., 'Iovöalioy. But the former is unauthorized, and indeed ineffectual; and the latter is a mere error of the scribes, arising from ignorance of some abbreviaton : besides that is so inapposite that scarcely any authority could justify it. Many eminent Commentators, including Kuin., take $\delta \times \lambda$ os to mean the multitude of the inferior priests as opposed to the leaders of the 24 classes. But that would require the Article, and then only increase the difficulty, which may best be removed by aking rod us of $x^{\lambda o s}$ in a restricted and popular sense of a considerable number. This is confirmed by Chrysost., who interprets it by mod $\frac{1}{}$ i. That a comparatively considerable number of the whole (which amounted to about 5000 ) should believe, is not strange, considering the miracles they had witnessed, both from Jesus and from the Apostles.
 the faith [of Jesus, i.e. the Gospel].' The expression is remarkable and occurs no where else.
8. жiorems] Several MSS, and Versions and some Fathers have Xd́pıtos, which is preferred by most Commentators and received by Griesb., Knapp, and Tittm.; but, I conceive, wrongly for we may better account for the change of тilorecos into xd́pitos than the reverse. Besides, the MSS. are chiefly such as abound in alterations; not to mention that the number of those MSS. is comparatively small, and the testimony of the Versions not quite valid. And although $\chi \dot{\alpha} \rho$. is not unsuitable, yet riorecos is more to the purpose. Vater has judiciously adopted the old reading.
9. $\Lambda \boldsymbol{\beta}$ eprivor]. Who are meant by these, is a question which will perhaps never be decided. The most probable opinion is that adopted by Wahl, that they were Jews, who had been taken captive by the Romans in war and carried to Rome; and having there been mana-
mitted, were accustomed to visit Jerusalem in such numbers as to erect a synagogue for their particular use ; as was the case with Jews from other cities mentioned in the context. Others think them to have been the posterity of Jews, who had been carried into Egypt and Libya by the Ptolemies or Pompey, and afterwards made free citizens of the places where they dwelt. Others suppose them to have been Jews who inhabited a city or tract called Libertum, somewhere in Africa Proconsularis; but there is no notice of the existence of any such city or region. See more in Recens. Synop., Townsend's Chr. Arr. ii. 54. \& 412. a., and Rose's Parkh. in v. By the Cyrenæans and Alexandrians, who seem to have had a synagogue to themselves, we are. of course, to understand Jews from Cyrene and Alexandria, in the latter of which places they were so numerous as to fill two of the four wards, and had a governor for themselves.
 is meant not merely human, but divine wisdom, as supplied by the Holy Spent; for mуeú $\mu$. sigunifies the influence of the Spirit, under whose inspiration he spoke.
 under ; 2.' to introduce a suppositious child to any mother; 3. to suborn, privily introduce any accuser. Examples, from the later writers, are adduced by the Commentators.

- $\lambda a \lambda$. $\dot{\rho} \mu \mu a \tau a \quad \beta \lambda \dot{\sigma} \sigma \phi \mu \mu a \quad \& c$.] This constituted a capital offence; for under the old Jewish Theocracy it involved the crimes lessee majestatis as well as blasphemy. The blasphemy against God has been well shown by Bp. Horsey in his Answer to Priestly, p. 232, to be asserting the Deity of Christ-which he died attesting.
 must be referred to the people, elders, and scribes, not to the suborners; for the subject is changed, as often in Scripture and the best writers, especoaly Thucyd. In such a case, the Commentutors take the cal for the relative; a bungling expedient, which explains nothing. We may render, 'and they having come upon him' \&c.

13. $\mu d \rho \tau u \rho a s ~ \psi e v \delta \epsilon \bar{s}]$ Namely, by intermingling falsehood with truth in their depositions, especially by perverting Stephen's words








to a sense not intended by him, or exaggerating what he did say. How they did this, and on the language really held by him, see Kuin. in Recens. Synop. Tó̇rou toù dyiou, i.e. the Temple.
14. dג入a' ${ }^{c t}$ ] This implies the notion of $a b-$ rogate, i.e. by the introducing of some other law.
15. eidoy-dr$\left.\gamma^{\text {anou }}\right]$ Some few Commentators think that Stephen's face was made to shine supernaturally, by a visible glory like that of Moses (Ex. xxxiv. 29.). But the far greater number, and thoee the most eminent, are agreed in interpreting it as a popular form of expression, indicating august majesty and divine grace, such as might inspire reverence and awe. And they appean to Esth. v.2. 2 Sam. xiv. 17 . xix. 27. Gen. xxxiii. 10. This latter interpretation seems preferable, since there is nothing said by St. Luke to lead us to suppose that this was a supernatural glory, like that of Moses; and as to the pasage of Exod., the air and manner of it differs materiall from that of the present. At the same time, I admit that the august majesty and angelic innocence which shone forth in the countenance of this great protomartyr, can only be ascribed to the power of the Holy Spirit; and therefore the case of Mooes may, not improperly, be compared with it.
VII. Now follows the Apology of St. Stephen before the Sanhedrim, which has been much misunderstood and wrongly estimated, from not adverting to the inartifificil cast of the composition; and particularly from not considering that the speech was abruptly broken off, and therefore cannot be erpected to have any completeness. Various views have been adopted, which are copiously detailed in Recens. Synop. The following sketch of the scope of the speech. the course of the argument carred on or intended \&c., formed from Schoettg. and Kuin., must suffice. " Stephen was accused of uttering blasphemour speeches against God, the Temple, and the Mosesic Law, because he had said that all these were to be abrogated by Jesus of Na zareth; thereby intending (as was represented) to introduce a new religion, and change and annul that of their fathers. This crimination he means to refute, by showing that he neither speaks nor teachees blasphemy, nor any thing that is at variance with true religion, but rather what is most agreeable thereto ; and that his expreseions are not to be so construed as if he rejected all worahip, it merely being their purpose to show that worship may be pleasing in the sight of God even without any visible Temple, or the external pomp of levitical ceremonies, on whose will it depends whether He will ordain it to be
celebrated in one or other of those modes. The major, therefore, of his adversaries is restricted; he shows that the proof is weak; and he would have satisfactorily evinced the minor to be falle, had he not been prevented by the fury of the Jews. The arguments which he employs are deduced from authority, and from ancient history. In reviewing their sacred history he glances at such circumstances as support his cause, showing that though the rites prescribed by Moees had God for their author, yet the Jews were not approved to God solely by ritual observances : that their Temple might be destroyed, and would be destroyed (as it had before been) unless they should repent and reform. (See Jerem. vi. 12. seqq.) Ie doubtless meant, withal, to take occasion to show, that Jeeus was to be regarded by the Sanhedrim as the Messiah, and that his doctrine was to be embraced; for in mentioning Moses he has brousht forward that passage of Deut. xviii. 15. which Peter also, wi. 22. has explained of the Messiah. He was, however, prevented from bringing his discourse to a conclusion; for, just as he mas on the point of applying this narration of the fortunes of the Israelitish nation to his own case, he was suddenly dragged away to punishment. Otherwise he would probably have shown how ill-founded was the confidence in which the Jews relied on circumcision, and the other ritual observances of the Temple service ; since lstly, Abraham, before he had been circumcised, was approved by God, and received evident tokens of the Divine favour; whereas many of the circumcised had not approved themselves in the sight of God: 2 dly , since God had, long before the building of the Temple, conferred many and signal blessings on the Israelitish nation ; nay did not even permit David to build the Temple, nor, in any way. take measures for its erection: and the temple of Solomon had been destroyed. Hence Stephen would have argued, that he had not spoken contumeliously of Moses and the Almighty, when he maintained that the Divine favour did not depend upon circumcision and the Temple worship; and that the Temple might be destroyed, nay would be destroyed, as it had formerly been, for the wickedness and impiety of the people. unless they should repent, and not, after the evii example of their forefathers, who had rejected Moes, persist in rejecting Jesus, the Messiah announced by Moses."
16. al-oitwor $\left.{ }^{2} \mathrm{Xec}\right]$. All the Editors point as if ei ${ }^{2} \rho a-$ ixel are given as the words of the High Priest. But thus the al must either be regarded as ploonastic, or taken in the sense num, of which, in directd oratione, there is no example. If, however, the words here be taken













in indirect d oratione, all difficulty will vanish; for thus the el may signify whether, as in Mark
 The sentence is suspended on a participle, $\dot{\epsilon \pi} \eta \rho \omega^{\prime} \tau \omega \nu$ or the like. And indeed such an ellipse is not unfrequent after verbs of speaking in the Indicative when followed by $\epsilon$. Nay, sometimes verbs not of speaking, e. gr. Mark
 aga has here the conjectural use, implying uncertainty, on which see Hoogev. de Part. Upon the whole, however, the construction may be said to be formed from a blending of the oratio direct with the indirecta.
 he means the multitude in general; and by татépes, the members of the Sanhedrim. The ädofs is merely pleonastic. See Note on i. 11 .
 insignis,' worthy of glory and honour. See $P_{s}$. xxiv. 8. xxix. 1.

- ply in kat. \&c.] To remove a seeming discrepancy between this passage and those of Genesis, the best Commentators are agreed in thinking that Stephen here followed the Jewish tradition, adopted by Philo, that God appeared twice to Abraham, list, when living in Chaldea, 2 dly , when resident at Charran.

3. $\delta \in \hat{u} \rho o]$ Sub. ed $\lambda \theta \dot{\epsilon}$, which is expressed in Atistoph. Thesm. 324. Such ellipses in hortatory particles are frequent.
 trifling discrepancy between this account and that in Genesis, the most probable solution of which seems to be that which proceeds on the supposition, that here also Stephen followed the tradition of the Jews.
4. oúk éduкev] The best Commentators are agreed that ébwnev is to be taken in a pluperfect sense, and that the oi is for ойтс. Ouse $\beta \hat{\eta} \mu \alpha$ roods is to be taken as we say popularly, 'not a foot of land,' for, none at all. See Deut. ii. 5 . (lien. viii. 1. and the examples of Wets. from the

 occupancy, and, by the adjunct, possession and property.

6,7. The passage is from Gen. xv. 13 and 14,
and, as the Commentators remark, is cited from memory. There are several variations from the Sept., though none but such as are quite animportant, except that, 1. cal raxєivaíavoz airove are added after can. Yet the words are not in the Hebrew, and seem to have come from the margin as a gloss, probably from Judith v. 11.; or perhaps are a different version of ass. 2. The words Eitacy $\dot{o}$ leos are found neither in the Hebrew nor LXX. But they form no part of the quotation, being a parenthetical clause not infrequent in Scripture. As to the
 neither in the Hebrew nor the LXX., but only in the N. T., there is no proof of discrepancy, because Stephen evidently did not mean to adduce those words, but stops at $\epsilon$ そe入evorovtac. The only discrepancy is in the words cal $\lambda$ arpent
 in the Hebrew nor the Sept. But Stephen doe not adduce the words as immediately following the preceding. And Surenh. has proved that it was a custom with the Jewish Doctors. (and therefore probably adopted by the writers of the N. T.) when they cited any passages of the O. T., to sometimes add words elsewhere employed on the same subject, and occasionally with a slight variation, for adaptation. And, not to say, with Krebs, that the words are found in substance at v. 16, they seem to have been suggested by the eide of the LXX.. (which, however, has nothing corresponding in the Hebrews) and the phraseology was, no doubt, taken from a kindred passage at Exod. iii. 12. \&v Tee effs-

 there is no actual discrepancy; and the two other variations from the LXX. are very small, and are either justified by the Hebrew, or may have had place in the Version of the LXX. as it was originally formed, for so many and so marvellous are the variations which have been found by the recent collation of the MSS., that we can scarcely venture to say that any variation of the above kind was not in the Sept.; nay, almost to warrant the supposition, that after the first Version, another, or at least another Edition with alterations, was sent forth by the Alexandian Jews.














IIaposnov well expresses the Hebr．Jj，be－ cause，as the latter is a participial noun，so is the former properly an adjective，as appears from Herodot．vii． 235 ．Thus，in the Hebr．הידי 73， we may suppose a participial noun and the verb substantive as put for the finite verb，from which the participial noun is derived．If this criticism be well founded，it will follow that the version of our Translators in this passage of the N．T． is preferable to that adopted in the correspond－ ing one of the $O . T$ ．
－retpaкóбเa］The Chronological difficulty is not so much in the thirty gears difference be－ tween this estimate and that of Josephus（be－ cause reтрaк．may be taken as a round number， and even Josephus himself sometimes calls it 400）as how to reconcile this with the fact，that the lsraelites were in Egypt at the most but 243 years．Nor can this difficulty be satisfactorily removed by the parenthesis which Mark．would introduce；and the construction of the Hebrew will not permit it．The difficulty may best be removed by bearing in mind，that the subject of the verbs and $2 y$ ，as also of sov入oi天ovat and кaxぁjovova，is to be sought in the noun $\gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma} \bar{\eta}$ ， and thus it will be the inhabitants of that land． And if the truth of chronology limits the abode of the Israelites in Egypt to 243 years，and assigns 400 as the time which elapsed between Abraham＇s leaving Chaldea and the period when they were established in Canaan，I see not how we can suppose otherwise than that the verbs above mentioned，though having a common sub－ ject in $\gamma \bar{\eta}$, yet have a turo－fold reference，in the former verb to the Egyptians，in the latter to the inhabitants of the countries wherein they sojourned in affliction from the time they left to the time they were settled in Canaan．Thus we may render，＇And they（i．e．the Egyptians） shall enslave them，and they（i．e．the Edomiter， Canaanites，\＆c．）shall afflict them．＇It is true that the Commentators，with our common Yer－ sion，take as a verb neuter；and this is maintained by Rosenm．in his Schol．nov．Fd． Yet he is obliged to suppose，with great harsh－ ness，the suffix o as put for the separate form art．But that（I would suggest to him ）is surely courting a difficulty，since the verb indy be taken in an artice cense，a，it was by the I．XX．，and
is done by Montanus，nay，also by one＂nostrum meliori utroque，＂Gesenius，who in his Lex．gives several examples，and resolves the suffix $口$ into ；though ellipsis rather than resolution seems to be the principle here to be resorted to．
－крıуш̄］＇I will punish；＇a signification arising from the adjunct．See Pearce．

8． sealed by circumcision．The recent Commen－ tutors，for the most part，take it to mean＇a pre－ cept or rite of circumcision．＇But the authority for that signification is but slender，and the ne－ cessity for it here not very urgent；for the objec－ tons raised by Kuin．to the common version，do not apply to the above．This use of the Genit． is frequent．That the absence of the Article does not compel us to render＇a covenant，＇as Wakef．has done，is certain from the rule of Apollonius，adduced by Bp．Middl．Gr．Art．iii． 6 6．namely，＂that of two nouns，the latter in regimen with the former，and both definite in sense，the Article is prefixed to both the govern－ ing and the governed，or else is omitted before both．＂An omission（observes Bp．Middlet．） will therefore frequently be observable where the governing noun might seem to require the definite form．
－cal oürms ］＇and so，＇i．e．in virtue of that covenant．Matpıápxas．So called as being the primogenitors and heads of the marpial or tribes．
9．axédonto cis Alp．］Here there is（Markl． observes）an ellipse of коньоөíбоцеvov，of which the Commentators adduce many examples．As． however，they do not adduce a single example of the complete phrase，we may rather suppose that $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\delta} \delta$ ．is what the Grammarians call a vow pragn．

10．Xápıv cal $\sigma о \phi i a y]$ The best Momenta－ tors are agreed in regarding this as a Hendiadys， for $\chi$ ג́ $\rho \iota \nu$ roф ias，＇favour by his wisdom．＇But that is contrary to the nature of an Hendiadys． It would be better to simply suppose a hysteron proteron．Yet that will be unnecessary，if we take dyavciov as belonging to both xapiv and Goфiav，with adaptation to each，q．d．＇gave him favour in the sight of Pharaoh，and wisdom in his presence，＇i．e．so as to be manifest to him． Oiкоу aütoü，＇his court．＇
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11．xоןтáбмaтa］The word is properly used of food for cattle；and（like xo $\quad$ rdyos in the N．T．and the later Greek writers frequently） is very rarely applied to food for men；（see Valckn．）when it is，it is only to the coasser sorts，and such as are used from necessity，as is the case with the phrase yemíai riju кoi入iav in Lu．xv． 16.

12．oira］The plural is used to denote gene－ rality of kind，as we say corn，or grain．Пpiórov， for трóтєроу．

13．iv тG deurépu］scil．Tẹ Хро́ve，at the second time of their going．Avejvospioon， ＇made himself known．＇This use of the Passive （like the Hebrew conjunction Hithpahel）an－ swers to the reflected verbs of the modern lan－ guages．

14．$\langle\nu \psi v x a i s s \dot{e} \beta \delta$ ．］The best Commentators would supply ouvıorauévŋ̀．But that is too arbitrary an ellipse．In fact，there is none at all ；for in the passage of Deut．x．22．，on which the present is formed，the $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ is for $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu$ ，or rather $ב$ is for with，accompanied by．So Numb．xx． 20. Tבים The best mode of removing the seeming discrepancy in the number is that of Hamm．，Wets．，and others，who think that the IXX．numbered among the posterity of Jacob the five sons of Manasseh and Ephraim born in Egypt，and that these were omitted by Moses because they were born after Jacob＇s departure， but by the LXX．at Gen．xlvi．20．are expressly added from Paral．vii． 14.

16．As to the discrepancy between the present account and that in Gen．xlix．30，the best Critics are agreed that＇$\Delta \beta \rho a \alpha \mu$ is spurious，and that $\mu \in \tau е \tau e ́ \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ and $\dot{\prime} \tau \dot{\prime} \theta \eta \sigma a \nu$ are to be re－ ferred to the words oi warépes गj $\mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ only，not to＇Iaxcio also；and that at coviraaro we must supply，from the preceding，＇Iaxci $\beta$ ；which is far beiter than taking covivaro impersonally，by an ellipse of ris．The reading of some MSS． $\dot{\text { o marip，}} \dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ attests at least that，at an early period，＇A $\beta \rho a \alpha \mu$ was not here．May it not， however，be possible that the original reading was $\delta$ жатท́ $\dot{\eta}^{\prime} \mu \bar{\omega}$ ，meaning Jucob；and that
afterwards＇$A \beta \rho a a^{\prime} \mu$ was introduced from the margin，where it was merely meant to indicate the reference，and afterwards，as has often hap－ pened，expelled the original reading？

17．кa0ios］＇when；＇a very rare sense，but occurring in 2 Macc．1．31．and formed on that of wis，when．It may best be rendered，as sonn as（formerly written assoon as）．＇O xpóvos rīs $d \pi$ ．，＇the time for the fulfilment of the pro－ mise．＇On this force of the Genit．，see Matth． Gr．Gr．

18．oúk ỳ $\delta$ el rdv＇I．］The best Commentators are agreed that the sense is，＇had no regand for Joseph or his merits，＇was ill affected to him and his memory ；as 1 Thess．iv．4．v．12．Matt． xxv．13．The whole verse is almost verbatim from Exod．i． 8.

19．катaбофıбdцєyos］The word properly signifies to subdue by artifice，to circumvent； but here the sense is，＇plotting our destruction by crafty devices；a sentiment farther evolved in a kindred passage of Judith v．11．，which St． Stephen，no doubt，had in view ：кal érapéom

 dтaжeivasay aùtoùs，кal ËOevto aútoùs cis doúdous．So Ezechiel，the Tragedian，applies to this conduct of Pharaoh the term donos；and his policy is called by Philo the using exawoias ג⿱亠乂⿰丿丿⿱日十 presses scope and purpose．Hoceìy entera is for éctitival，a term appropriate to the abandon－ ment of infants．It is strange that Hamm． Pearce，and Wakef．should understand this of the Egyptians causing or ordering the exposure． not of the Israelites themselves．The words will not bear that sense，and the context rejects it ； for here we have an illustration of the crafty policy of Pharaoh，which was to reduce the Is－ raelites to a state of such extreme misery that the population might in every way be kept down． This whole passage is formed on Exod．i． 10 \＆

 aútov̀s t̀v rois èpyots．
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20．datcios rā Өeē］＇Aatcios is from the dat．sing．of dंनtv，and properly signifies（like the Latin urbanus）polite as opposed to $\alpha \gamma \rho o$ iкos． And as the inhabitants of cities are supposed to excel those of the country not only in politeness， but also in comeliness，so docreios came to mean handsome ；or，as Aristotle maintains，smart or pretty．Tä $\theta$ ecu is by the Commentators re－ ferred to a Hebraism，by which，to express the excellence of any person or thing，the names of God，or even of the angels，are subjoined in the Genit．or Dat．to the Positive，which thus at－ tains a Superlative sense．The Greeks effect this by an adjectice derived from some name of God．＇Os is to be resolved into＇and he．＇

21．èkтє日évra dè aürdv］These are generally regarded as Accusatives absolute；though recent Commentators prefer supposing a pleonasm of aüdy，which，however，within so short a dis－ tance，can hardly be admitted．Perhaps it may better be referred to an idiom treated on by Matthim Gr．Gr．§426．3，by which，to a sub－ stantive expressing the leading idea of a propo－ sition，and put at its beginning，is supplied quod attinet ad，where the old Philologists supposed an ellipse of кara，but the recent ones suppose a breaking off of the construction．＇Aveleनeat properly signifies to take up，and is often used of raising up drowning men from the sea，and taking up corpses for burial；but sometimes，as here，of taking up exposed children．By the very nature of the sense there is an adjunct notion of taking care of．＇Bautip els vidy，i．e． els vidu daurin．
22． kraciev $^{2}$ \＆ce．］In adverting to this cir－ cumstance，Stephen，as before，seems to follow the tradition of the Jews；for nothing to this effect in found in Scripture．On the vast extent of the wisdom of the Esyptians，see Recens． Sypop．
－duyards＿ipyors］This may seem incon－
sistent with the impediment，which Moses is known to have had in his speech．Insomuch that at Exod．iv．16．it is said that Aaron was to be his spokesman to the people．But，as the best Commentators are agreed，ठúvaros and $\dot{d \nu}$入óyoss may be applicable to persuasive and there－ fore powerful，though not elegant，oratory．And that Moses had this faculty，we learn from Joseph． Ant．iii．1．4．and may infer it from Seripture． 1 would here compare Thucyd．i．139．तéjeıv
 ＂Epyous is well explained by Chrysost．трáүмaбt， business；for so 1 would read，for the vulg． урддлдась．
23．Terg．xpóyos］．This fact，too，is founded solely on Jewish tradition，of which vestiges are found in the Rabbinical writings．On $\alpha v e \beta_{n}$ \＆c．see Note on Lu．xxiv． 38.

 i．e．not unto death，as we find from what follows． That Moses intended to slay the Egyptian，can－ not be proved．
25．cuvieval－awonpiav］＇to perceive that God is［or was］giving them deliverance．＇ Aütoîs scil．dide入 $\phi$ ois，＇some of his brethren，＇ i．e．as we find by what follows，two．Maxom－ évots．We might understand it，with many In－ terpreters，of strife，but that the words of Exodus compel us to take it of fighting．
26．бuvilacev—eipyiviv］Euve入aúsecy signi－ fies properly to compel a person to go any where by hedging him in，and leaving him no other course．It is，however，in the later writers used of compulsion generally ；and sometimes，as here， the moral compulsion of earnest persuation is meant．
27．Tis $\sigma e$ кaтiбтnбev－i imãs］This has the air of a proverbial expression，and may be com－ pared with what the Sodomites said to Lot， Gen．xix．9．Compare also Lu．xii． 14.
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30．$\Sigma เ \nu \bar{a}]$ Moses says Horeb．But the moun－ tain had a double summit，（like Parnassus） forming two peaks，one Horeb，the other Sinai． So Mifton：＂Sing heavenly muse，that on the sacred top Of Horeb，or of Sinai，didst inspire＂ $\& c$.
－ì $\phi \lambda o \gamma i$ пupds $\beta$ ．］Literally，in a flame of a bush of fire，i．e．on fire，unless the Genit． $\pi u \rho d s$ be for an adjective．It is scarcely neces－ sary to advert to the unhallowed speculations of some recent foreign Commentators on the nature of this circumstance，which they seek to lower to the level of a natural phænomenon，and endea－ vour to account for in various ways；but in vain；for the preternatural（and what else could have answered the purpose）cannot，after all，be got rid of．It were well if the persons in ques－ tion would here learn a lesson from the heathen suges，the theme of their too indiscriminate an－ miration．Thus Pind．Pyth．x．76．$\dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{ol}$ dè


 tavocie properly signifies＇to master any thing in thought，to＇understand；＇but here，by a usual interchange of the notions of internal and external sense，to examine，of which examples are adduced by the Commentators．
32．है⿱亠䒑⿱亠乂卩ромог］Of the same formation with ${ }^{\prime} \mu \phi$ овos，words conjoined in Hebr．xii．21．The tremor is not，however，with most Commentators， to be ascribed so much to fear as to auce．
 a due cleanliness in the performances of any of the offices of religion，it was，from the earliest ages，directed that the worshipper should take off his sandala before he entered a temple．And the
custom still continues in the East，whence it． no doubt，originated．From thence it seems to have passed to Ekypt，where it was observed，and borrowed by Pythagoras，who，among his other
 iepá т poglévat．
34．ibcis cidov］＇planissimè cogrovi．＇This idiom，by which to a verb is subjoined a parti－ ciple，either of the same verb or one of cognate signification，though by most Commentators es． teemed a Hebraism，is yet pure Greek，though it occurs so rarely as scarcely to alter the case． The idiom is，no doubt，of Oriental origin，and the few examples found in the Classical writers are among the vestiges of the Oriental origin of the Greek language．Thus they are chieffy ad－ duced from the most antient writers，and in the antique dialects．
－кат $\dot{\beta} \eta \nu \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \in \lambda \dot{e} \sigma \theta \alpha l]$ From this Kuin．takes occasion to observe，that the antients supposed the Deity to act mach after the manner of men． Yet expressions like the present ка $\boldsymbol{\tau}^{\boldsymbol{\prime}} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\rho}$ es－ тота日eiay were rather resorted to from neces－ sity，originated in human ignorancs，and were used in condescension to kuman weakness．
35．тoútov－Toürov］The construction is here
 after the parenthesis for the sake both of clear－ ness and strength．Aujpcotiv．The word pro－ perly means one who redeems another from captivity by paying the $\lambda \dot{u}$ тpan or ransom．
36．Alyuxtov Alyúntب is found in many MISS．and early Edd．，and is preferred by several Editors and Commentators．

 must oley．















38．$\dot{\text { o }} \chi \in \nu \dot{\prime} \mu \in \nu o s-\mu e \tau a]$＇who had communi－ cated with，＇namely，by acting as mediating inter－ preter between ciod and the ixan $\eta$ oia，i．e．the assembly of Israelites congregated on Mount Sinai，at the promulgation of the Law．On the a $\gamma \gamma$ en，，mee Note on v． 53.
－$\zeta_{\bar{\omega} \nu \tau a}$ 乡й $\nu \tau a$ ，has several significations not inapposite．The most probable is either callid，etticacious，of certain fulfilment；or，taking そَüta for Ywo llebr．x．20．（and so in Deut．xxxii．47．the law is said to be（ $\omega$（ri）＇most salutary ；＇or，again． conjoining both significations，＇most efficacious and salutary．
 Commentators taken to mean，they were intent on returning，their mind dwelt on returning thither．＇See Exod．xvi．3．xvii．3．Others inter－ pret，＇their affections reverted back to Fsypt， its sensuality and idolatry．＇see Ezek．xx． 8 ． This latter interpretation is confirmed by what follows；but the first mentioned may be in－ clucled．

40．Acois］i．e．images of（iod．Oit tooztop． $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ ．It was customary with the Oriental na－ tions of antiquity for the images of the Gods to be borne before the people in journeys，or mili－ tary expeditions，since they fancied they thus enjoyed their more effectual protection．See Numb．x．33．compared with Deut．xxxi．8． 1 Sam．iv．3．（Heinr．\＆Kuin．）
－ì $\gamma \dot{\operatorname{aj}}$ M Mōns \＆c．］A common anacolu－ thun，to be filled up in translating by a quod uttinel ad．It is frequent in the Oriental writers， and indeed in all writers in the popular dialect both of the Fast and Hest．
41．еногхотоinбay］They had seen in Esypt Divinities worshipped under certain forms，and they were led to chuse that of a golden calf，or ox，for a symbol of the true God，（though trans－ gressing the Divine command，Exod．xx．4．） lecause the E－gyptians worshipped Osiris，a former monarch of Egypt，and the inventor or introducer of agriculture，\＆c．，under the form of a bull，（Apis）as the symbol of agricultural labour．（kuin．）
－¿urizayon Bualay］＇Ayáreer signifies to briug up，and，from the adjunct，to lay upon；
and is often used，especially in the later writers， of laying the victim on the altar．So the Hebr． העלה．Eúqpalvovto iv．The sense is＇cele－； brated sacnficial feastings to the honour of．＇ See Fxod．xxxii． 6.
 variously explain this；but the true interpreta－ tion is doubtless that of Beza，Pisc．，Casaub．， Grot．，Hamm．，Wets．，Kuin．，and others，aversus est．active for passive；or se avertit，act．for refexive．Парєбокеv，＇gave them up，suffered them to serve，＇\＆c．So Chrys．and Theophyl． ciage．ミт
 the twelve minor（or shorter）Prophets，usually， it seems，bound in one volume．
 tence usbered in by $\mu \dot{\eta}$（answering to the Hebr． $\pi$ ）has generally the force of a strong negation． But as it appears from Scripture，that the Israelites did offer sacrifices to God in the desert，some other mode of explanation must be adopted．See Recens．Synop．I am still of opinion that the following，which I there pro－ pounded，is the most simple and the true one． by assigning this sense：＂Did ye indeed offer to me sacrifices for forty years in the wilderness： ［yes；］and yet［кal for кairor］so little real was your piety，that［in conjunction with my worship］ye raised the tabernacle of Moloch．＇

It is not unfrequent for a question thus put to be supposed to be answered in the affirmative． Chrys．

On the subject which of the Gods or Kings the Israelites worshipped under the name of Moloch（which signifies a Sorrereign Lord）see Recens．Synop．Some suppose Saturn；others， the Sun，（the King of heaven）which is the more probable opinion．All the nations of an－ tiquity applied terms indicative of royalty to their Gods．Thus，besides Moloch，Rel or Baal． Moloch was an image of immense size and hol－ low，brass gilt ；（like several of the Birman idols） with the face of a calf or bull，and the hands outstretched，very much like the Mexican idols described by Humboldt．This，however，only answers to the description of the idol in after times．At the priod in question the idol was，
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no doubt, of small size, to admit of being easily hidden from the view of Moses and Aaron; and the $\sigma \kappa r^{\prime} u \eta$ will thus denote a sort of case to inclose and convey it in, formed (it may be supposed) in imitation of a real tabernacle, and very much like those gilt shrines, or small models of the temple of Diana at Ephesus mentioned at Acts xix. 24, where see Note. 'Aveld́ßete refers to the bearing it on the shoulders, as in religious processions, or when raised and placed aloft at the celebration of religious worship.
43. Td aंotpon toù $\Theta$ eoù ímềy i. e. the image of him whom ye account as a God and worship under the image of a star.
 exists among Commentators. Mr. Townsend has diligently detailed the various hypotheses formed by the learned to reconcile the apparent discrepancy between the Hebrew, the LXX., and St. Luke. As to the two last, it is plain that the same name is meant by both. The chief diversity is in the $\mu$, which should seem not to have place. The 'Péqay of many MSS. of the N. T. or the 'Paıфaiv of the LXX. seems to be the true spelling. Unless it be thought that the $\mu$ stands for another $\phi$, of which there is some vestige in the MSS. Be that as it may, all the most learned inquirers are agreed that by 'Peфàv or 'Paıфa'y was meant Saturn, of whom it was one of the names. And they are almost alike agreed in considering the Chiun of the Hebrew as only another name of the same idol-deity. Moloch is also, with probability, supposed to be another of the same personage, the compound idol (says Mr. Townsend) originally designed to represent the great Father, or Neah, who was afterwards made the emblem of the Sun, the God of Zabaism. What is meant by the star is best explained by Faber ap. Townsend.
43. Kal] 'and so,' i. e. because of your idolatry and sinfulness, and that of your forefathers. Meтоккьш. The word generally imports no more than to emigrate ; but must here be understood of compulsory removal. 'Exéceiva is a compound expression, by an ellipee of
 writers it is usually preceded by the Article in any case, which, however, is sometimes omitted, especially in the later writers. For Babylon we have in the Hebrew and LXX. Damascus, the best solution of which difficulty is given by Pearce ap. Rec. Synop.
44. Having dwelt on the ingratitude, impiety,
and idolatry of the Israelites, Stephen adverts to the place of true Divine worship, the Tiy oxio ข $\eta \boldsymbol{\nu}$ тoū $\mu \alpha \rho \tau 0 \rho i o u$, by which the LXX. expressed the tabernacle destined to religions assemblies, from which God issued his oracles.

- каөшंs ठıетdそато \&c.] The construction is elliptical, and the sense, when complete, is this: ' [so built] as He who had conversed with Moses (i.e. Jehovah) had commanded him to build it after the model shown to him. See Exod. 25. compared with Hebr. viii. 5.
 ceived it as handed down from their ancestors.' Mera 'Inooû, 'with Joshua.' The words are to be construed immediately after oi zrarcipes.
 agreed that \&̀v caraбXéres is for cis кardoxerw,
 $\sigma$ óver. and Deut. xxxii. 51., 'into a land possessed by Gentiles.' So supra v. 5. סoūvai dis ката́ $\bar{x} \in \sigma \iota \nu$ aúrทiv (riv yйv). And so the LXX. render for
 $a \sigma \chi^{e i ̃ \nu} \tau \dot{\alpha} \delta_{0 \nu \eta}$. But this requires a harsh ellipse after cionjayov. I have, with Owen, Gratz, and Kuin., removed the comma after $\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$, because ëms тテ̄́v $\dot{\eta} \mu$. $\Delta$. cannot withort great harshness be referred to eloriyayoo: whereas, when referred to efwoev \&c., the construction is natural, and the sense yielded excellent; for, as Pearce observes those nations were not completely driven out till the days of David. Newc. well represents the sense of ezwoey by 'continued to drive out.' 'A ard roü тробю́коv is a Hebraism corresponding to 29 מעt in the Hebrew Bible, and found in an ancient Punic inscription mentioned by Procopius.

46. єijpe] 'obtained.' The phraseology is Hebraic. 'H Triбaro, 'asked for himself.' Bupeĩv Newc. renders provide. De Dieu and Kuin. meet the difficulty by a device of construction which is very harsh, and, indeed, unnecessary; for it may be effectually removed by a reference to Ps. cxxxii. 5, on which the expression here
 rendered by supplying what is necessary to the sense from the preceding member, of which this is an exegetical parallelism, 'Until I have found out a [place for, i. e. wherein I may build a] habitation' \&c. For all the former member as far as $b$ is to be repeated in the latter clause.










47. vaois]. This is omitted in 7 MSS. and several Versions, and is cancelled by Griesb. but, without sufficient reason, it being defended by Acts xvii. 24. Mark xiv. 58. Hebr. ix. 11 \& 24. ; though, I grant, it might be introduced from the first of those passages. Nor is it very probable that the words should have been omitted from the homeoteleutom. Internal evidence is against it, but the external evidence for it is very strong ; and as the ellipse is too hansh for the popular style, it should be retained, though in brackets. Karoocei suggests the adjunct notion of 'is not to be contained by.' See Ecumen.

49,50. The variations here from the LXX. are in a manner none, if déyer K'uptor be taken as interposed from what comes alter. In the concluding words, indeed, for oixi- ${ }^{1}$ dyra,
 which is countenanced by the Hebrew, where, if the present copies be correct, the sentence is expressed not interrogatively, but declaratively. 1 suspect, however, that the text is slightly corrupt, and needs the emendation which it may receive from the $N$.T. The corruption, if I mistake not, rests on תnon, which contains something not much to the purpose; for to take the $t$ in the sense for, is somewhat strained. Some MSS. omit the ; but that is only cutting the knot. I cannot but suspect that the Prophet wrote nonne? which occurs in Gen. iv. 7. and elsewhere. How easily 1 and $r$ and $r w$ and $\alpha$ might be confounded it is scarcely necessary to say.

I cannot but observe that in the words immediately following, our common version 'and all these things have been' canaot be justified, as containing no suitable sense, nor such as the Hebrew words compel us to adopt. Still less can I approve Bp. Lowth's version, 'and all these things are mine.' He is pleased, indeed, to suppose (which he thinks absolutely necessary to the sense ) lost out of the text, and to be supplied from the LLXX. and Syr. This, however, is rash. The Syriac generally follows closely the LXX. and the Sept. Version is not by any means formed with such accuracy as to enable us to be sure what was in the Hebrew when it was made. Not to say that ${ }^{\circ}$ b would not be sood Hebrew. I suspect the i $\mu \mathrm{a}$ of the Sept. to have been introduced from a guess of the sence by the aid of the context. So lar from the addition being indispensable, I see nothing wanting, if the passage be ( as it ought to be) thus translated: "All these things did not my hand create? and they all of them were,' i. e. brought
into being.' So Revel. iv. 11. (which seems to have been in the mind of St. John) öTt ov
 ท̀jav кal iкriovnoav.
51. There is here an abruptness of transition, which has led some Commentators to maintain that something was now said which has not been recorded by St. Luke. This, however, proceeds upon a most objectionable principle. The best Interpreters are agreed that this change of style and manner, and the transition from calm narration to sharp rebuke, was occasioned by wome interruption on the part of the auditors. Yet that might not be, as they imagine, by open tumult and clamours for the death of the prisoner, but rather (as Doddr. and Kuin. suppose) by low but deep murmurings, or hises, and threatening gestures; which will account for and justify (if what is spoken under the influence of the Holy Spirit can need justification) the severity of this concluding portion of the speech.

- $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o r \rho \alpha \times \eta \lambda_{0}$ ] In most languages obstinacy and perversity are expressed by terms derived from the notion of stiffness, or hardress.
 The $\tau \bar{j} \kappa a \rho \delta i a$ is added to show that the word is to be taken figuratively. For as circumcision was a symbol of moral purity, so $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau o \mu{ }^{\prime}$ is, in the Old and New Testament, often applied to the mind and heart. See Jer. iv. 4. Thus by बжгрiт. Tӣ кapdia are meant those whose vices are yet uncorrectéd. See Levit, xivi. 41. Exek.
 who turn a deaf ear to all calls to moral purity, " whose ear (in the words of Jerem. vi. 10.) is uncircumcised, and they cannot hearken.'
 and oppose the Holy Spirit ${ }^{\text {b }} \mathrm{i}$. e. the testimony of those who speak by the Holy Spirit, which is regarded as tantamount to resisting the Holy Spirit himself. See Matth. x. 40. and the parrallel passages. Their forefathers had alike rejecter the prophets sent from God, and inspired by the Holy Spirit. 'Avtimisteciy is properly used of one body falling foul of another, and figuratively signifies to resist. At cal there is an ellipse of oütco.

52. toin sicaiov] 'the Messiah ;' the term being (as Middl. observes) evidently used кar' $\$ \xi 0 x{ }^{2} \nu$ to denote Christ. See iii. 14 \& 22. and Note on Lu. xxiii. 47. In proof of the fact, that the name was used by the Jews to denote the expected Meesiah, Bp. Middl. has adduced the strongest evidence in a long extract from 6.65 . of the Diseert. Gener. subjoined to Kennicoth's

$3_{0}$ et esig．
Gal．
$m$ infrise．
${ }_{9}{ }^{2}$

Hebrew Bible，to which he has added some valuable additional proofs and illustrations． Mpodorac kal фoveis yeyiv．The former by delivering him into the hands of Pilate，the latter by requiring him to be put to death on false charges．

53．els scarayàs drye入my］Many eminent Commentators take this to mean＇hosts of angels being present at the promulgation，＇i．e．of the Law，or＇in the presence of hosts of angels．＇ And they adduce sufficient to countenance， but not establish this interpretation，which is liable to various objections，especially that there is no proof of diarayal ever meaning troops or squadrons．The preference，therefore，seems due to the interpretation of Beza，Hamm．， Schoettg．，Pearce，Kraus，Heinr．，Koppe，Kuin．， and others，who assign this as the sense of the clause：＇Ye who have received the law by the promulgation of angels［as ministering instru－ ments］．$\Delta$ carayn is thus used by a metonymy of cause for effect，and eis is for $d \nu$ ，i．e．$\delta<\alpha$ ，of which use see examples in Schleus．and Wahl． It is，then，the same as if it were written $\dot{e} \lambda \alpha \beta$ ere
 ral is put for the singular by accommodation to the plural $d \gamma \gamma^{\lambda} \lambda c \infty \nu$ ，which is said by the Com－ mentators to be used agreeably to the Jewish opinion，that the Law was promulgated by angels，as secondary authors．See Joseph．Ant． xv．5，3，and the citations of Wets．and Schoettg． from the Rabbinical writers．This also is con－ firmed by Gal．iii．19，where the Law is said to have been diarayels $\delta i ' d \gamma \gamma \in \lambda \omega \nu$ ，and Heb．ii． 1．$\lambda a \lambda \eta \theta e l s{ }^{\circ} i^{\prime} d \gamma \gamma^{\text {encos．}}$

At ¿фu入ágare the discourse seems to have been quite broken off，otherwise there would have been adduced the inference＂$S$ o then it is you and not $I$ who are destroying the temple and changing the law．＂

65．тvé́rãos ay．］This must denote the infuence of the Holy Spirit animating and supporting him under the trial he had to en－ counter．
－Aies $\delta \delta \xi\{a \nu$ Beoū］Grot．，Wolf，and others understand by this $\delta 6 \in a$ a cloud emitting light－ ning，as a symbol of the Divine presence ；and they think that the heaven was made so trans－ parent，or the visual faculties of Stephen so miraculously strengthened，that the throne of Christ＇s glory became visible．This view，how－ ever，is，I apprehend，liable to insuperable ob－ jections，which are stated in Recens．Synop． Mr．Townsend has indeed，advocated this hypo－ thesis ；which he supports with his usual ability．
but less than his usual saccess．I can，however． by no means approve of the view taken by mary recent Interpreters，who regard the woods as so more than a strongly figurative mode of expre－ sion，importing full persuasion of what he ait not see，as if he actually saw it．The words will not，without violence，admit of this construc－ tion；and what follows，＇Ioov 0ceopee quite fortis it，being a positive assertion of something reall： seen．We may underatand it of the Scheckineh． or symbol of the Divine presence；but I would rather，with some antient and modern Commea－ tators，suppose a visionary reprosentation，God miraculously operating on Stephen＇s imagina－ tion，as on Ezekiel＇s，when he sat in his house at Babylon among the Elders of Judah，and saw Jerusalem，and seemed to himself transported thither．See Ezek．viii．1－4．
The best Commentators are agreed that Jecus was represented as sitting at the right hand of God，to suggest to Stephen the present help an－1 support he might expect from the Divist power．
 signifies properly，not to stop the ears，（Latin occludere aures），but to close up the ears by drawing them together，called in the Classical
 $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\omega} \tau \alpha$ ．This they did，not so much to avoid hearing the fancied blasphemy，as it was a symbolical action expressive of detestation and abhorrence ；as is plain from the passages of the Classical and Rabbinical writers adduced（from Pric．and Wets．）in Recens．Synop．So Plutarch

 must be considered in the same light，and not viewed as merely meant to drown the voice of Stephen，is plain from a passage of Irenzens cited by Wets．and perhaps imitated from the
 каріоs каl dтобтодекds треб阝b̆тероs，dva－

58．ex $\kappa \beta \alpha \lambda$ óvtes＇having hurried him out of the city．＇Compare a kindred passage at Lu． iv． 29.
－iditoobo ${ }^{2}$ ovr］Because we have a little
 complains of an unnecessary repetition of the same thing．The difficulty（at which even Valckn．stumbled）may be removed by either， with Heinr．，considering the first è之，$\theta o \beta$ ．as denoting preparation for action，$q \cdot d$ ．they set about stoning him ；or，with Klotz，Pearce． Rosenm．，and Kuin．，taking the thing as ex－










pressed more Historicorum [or rather, I would cay, populariter] and then (after an insertion respecting the keeping of the clothes by Saul) particularly; narrating by whom he was stoned, and describing some circumstances which attended the stoning.

- dxetevrol A necessary preparation as the stones destined for such an office were exceedingly large. This laying aside garments in order to be lighter for any office was usual with the long vested inhabitants of Greece as well as of the East, and is alluded to by Aristoph. Vesp.
 воӓте каі- d'үүедлете.
Though the whole proceeding was illegal and tumultuous, yet (as Beza and Grot. observe) they conformed to the letter of the law, which directed that in cases of stoning the witnesses should cast the first stone, doubtless to denote their responsibility for what was done.
- veaviou] This term is used of men even in the flower of their age, and sometimes of those who have attained its maturity. Kin. observes (from Phavorinus) that it described any age from 23 to 40.

69. driкa入oúneyov \&ce. I Bentley and Valckn. propose to add $\theta e \delta \delta^{2}$. The $\theta N$, they think, might easily have been absorbed by the preceding ON. But that it should have happened in every known MS. is very improbable, not to say that the Article is wanted. If, indeed, we were compelled to suppose invocation to God, I see not how any thing short of the express insection of the word could be tolerated. That, however, is not the case; and why the Commentaters should have been so anxious to make Stephen offer up invocation to God, I know not ; since, as Marti. truly observes, " it were contrary to Stephen's intention, which was to die a martyr to the Divinity of Jesus Christ. So that it is only Him he invokes." There is no reason why Kúpooy 'Incoùy should not be supplied from the following words of the invocation $\frac{1}{\text { apse }}$ 'In $\eta o \bar{u}$. Subauditions from the context are even in the Classics sometimes taken from the words which follow. Or dтıка入oǘnevov may be taken in an aboolute sense, (an idiom frequent in the best writers) and thus джrik. and Xér, may be remdered 'making invocation to the following effect.' It is quite plain that Jesus is the object of the invocation; which Kuin. fully admits, confirming this view from Rev. xxii. 20. where in the words ioxov, Kúpie 'Inooū, it is certain that Jesus is addressed in prayer, as he is here, in terms which necessarily imply Divine power
and nothing short of Deity, even in language borrowed from his own holy example. See Lu. xxiii. 34. How ill the Socinians digest this may be imagined; but one would scarcely suppose that even they could resort to the desperate expedient of supplying roy $\delta$ X $\lambda$ on ad libitum. That, however, shows their conviction that rd's Oed cannot be supplied.
The best Commentators are agreed that defEat Td Tysuind $\mu$ au must mean 'receive my soul to the mansions of the blessed.' See Lu. xvi. 9. and Job. xiv. 3. and Notes, and consult Schoetty. ap. Recens. Synop.
 $\zeta p w$, signifies, by an ellipee of iv $\zeta$ up $\varphi$ or ora$\theta \mu \varphi \overline{\text {, }}$, (sometimes supplied) to weigh, and also (as the custom of remote antiquity was to weigh out, not number, money) to pay. And as God was by the Hebrews represented as weighing the actions of men, by placing the good and the evil ones in a pair of scales respectively, (see Dan. v. 27. Ps. xe. 8.) so Elan. and Kuin. take the phrase to mean, ' Do not examine their sin in the balance,' and consequently visit it with punishment. But we may more simply consider the sense as ' $D_{0}$ not put to the balance this their sin,' i. e. do not put it into the scale which contrains their sins, do not impute it to them, lay it not to their charge.

- exoour $\theta_{\eta}$ ] This is both an euphemism, and meant to suggest the composure with which this Protomartyr met so violent a death.
VIII. 1. इaüגos-airoü] These words are closely connected with the preceding, from which they ought not to have been disjoined by the division of Chapters. इuvrod. signifies to approve of any thing with another. Tittm. de Syn. 191. shows that it is not so strong a term as ouvidec.$\theta a t$ (which occurs in Rom. vii. 22. suv. Tee no $\mu$ © ) though the Commentators in general seem to suppose so.
- Tires] This must be received with some limitation for a very considerable number; for there is little doubt but that many of the lower rank were suffered to remain in Jerusalem.
 order to support the courage of these who staid, and the faith of those who had fled, being proerected by the providence of God in order to build the Church at Jerusalem, to promote its unity, and to govern it by their wisdom. The secondary causes of their escape during the persecution are (as Mr. Townsend observes) unknown.

2. бuyeкópıбау] इuyk. signifies properly to bring together ; but is specially used as a funereal
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term，like the Latin componere，and sometimes denotes not only the laying out of the body，but other preparations for its interment．This sense is rare in the Classical writers；but it occurs in Soph．Ai． 1068.
2．evidaßeis］It is not quite agreed among Commentators whether these persons were Chris－ tans，or not．Most think they were religious Jews，or Hellenist proselytes，and perhaps secret friends to Christianity．But as in Lu．ii．45．we have avis סiкasos cal evinaßis，there is no reason why those who celebrated the funereal rites，should not have been religious men，both Christians and well disposed Jews．To suppose， with Pric．and Doddr．，that they were Chris－ tians only，involves an unnecessary impro－ bability．
－етоиюбауто кот．\＆cc．］These words（formed perhaps on Gen．1．10．）show，by example，the great honours shown him．On the point of An－ tiquities see Recens．Synop，and my Note on Thucyd．ii．34．No．12．Transl．
 nifies properly to ravage and destroy，as a wild beast；but is often used of men，and signifies to waste or spoil，as said of things，or to destroy and persecute，as said of persons．Thus the sense here is equivalent to that in Gal．i． 13.


－катi nous oíкои clown．］The sense is， ＇entering into houses，＇＇going from house to house．＇See v． 42 \＆xx．20．In the words fol－ lowing the sense is imperfectly developed，to complete which and rectify the construction an obs is required after yuvaícas，the comma being cancelled after elбжopevó $\mu \in \nu 0 s$. इúpouv，bawl－ ing，apprehending；a use of the word of which the Commentators adduce many examples．

4．$\left.\delta \iota \hat{\imath} \lambda \theta_{o \nu}\right]$ The Commentators suppose an ellipse of Tiv x由＇pay or tai Xwipas．This，how－ ever，is too arbitrary，and it is better to repeat катà Tass iwo spas，or at least tais Xci pas from the preceding．At tiv 入óyov sub．тoũ Өeoũ or Kupíou．

5．cis тод入ı тท̂s hap．］The Commentators are not agreed whether by $\Sigma a \mu$ ．is meant the country，or its metropolis of the same name．The latter is the opinion of almost all the best Com－
mentators ；and with reason；since the former： interpretation seems excluded by v． 14 ；for to say that the country had received the Gospel， when it had been only preached at one city， would seem absurd．The Article rios is not D2－ cessary，（See Middlet．）since in such a case it is usually omitted，being implied．That some of the most ancient MSS．have the Article will at least show the antiquity of this interpretation： and although the name of the city had been re－ cently altered to Sebaste in honour of Augustus， still retained popularly its original appellation． －ékripuarev－Xplotón ］This does not ne－ cessarily mean more than the preaching the Gospel，and offering admonition or exhortation privately．See Hamm．on the distinction be－ tween кทрúббety and suayye入ǐcooas．Their authority to do this may very well be rested in their having（as they seem to have had）the extraordinary and miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit．Though indeed this question，so warmly debated by Whitby，as to their Clerical warrant， is frivolous $i$ since the distinction between the Clergy and Laity was，no doubt，not yet made， because it was not yet become necessary．
 in general agreed that this is for $\dot{e \pi} \boldsymbol{f} \sigma$ trevor，＂had faith in the Gospel．＇Comp．v．14．Examples from Joseph．，Philo，and the LXX．are adduced by the Commentators．The sense of opoovpadion （which must be construed with mporeì Yow）
 literally，＇on their hearing＇\＆c．

7．то入入ติ－Eทipxero The construction （somewhat obscure by transposition，of which see examples in Glass Phil．Sacr．p． 664 ．）is thus laid down by Ruin．：тvé́pata үáp diкá⿱㇒日pтa

 observe that demoniacs and those merely troubled with bodily disorders are carefully distinguished． ＇EET＇pXero is an example of the use of the neuter for the passive，the sense being＇were expelled．＇

9．$\sum(\mu \infty y]$ Commentators are generally agreed that this is Simon the Cypriot mentioned by Joseph．Ant．xx．5，2．as a pretender to magic． IIpoivinpxev．This is by some Commentators taken by itself，in the sense，＇had been staying；＇ but by others is joined with maycueser；and
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rightly, as appears from Lu. xxiii. 12. xpoünippon in exdpa jutes. where see Note. The sense is, 'had been pursuing magic.' Maycúw is a rare word, yet examples are adduced from Hippocr. and Plutarch. On the $\mu \dot{1}$ yo in the original sense see Note on Matt. ii. 1. "This appellation was, however, (observes Kuin.) then given even to strolling mountebanks, pretenders to a knowledge of medicine, natural philosophy, and astrology, which included fortune-telling by the stars, all of them being accompanied with the mummery of pretended incantations, besides other purposes, for evoking departed spirits and expelting demons." The beat Commentators, however, are of opinion that this Simon was a person of very superior order to the common run of such persons, being endued with much knowledge of natural philosophy; though he abused it to the purpose of working on the minds of the vulgar by pretended prodigies, throwing them into amazement, no doubt, by the exhibition of certain phenomena known only to himself. Whether he actually used sorcery, or produced extraordinary effects by Satanic influence, as Mr. Scott thinks, may be doubted.

- 入érov-uéray See Note on v. 36. Tina, some person. The Ecclesiastical historians tell us that he pretended to be God the Father, some say the Messiah, or the Paraclete. There is much uncertainty. He was no doubt willing to pass for whatever the multitude should please to account him. And they probably regarded him as the pro-
mise Messiah. See Calmest in v. and Mr. Townsend.
 every age and station.' E $\sigma$ Tiv in dúv. \&'c. This may, with Kuin., be explained by hypallage, in the sense, ' The power of God energizes in him,' 'He is a personification of the Almighty.' See Rom. i. 16. 1 Cor. ii. 4.

13. in тробкартерш্\% т. Ф.] 'used to attend on Philip,' viz. as a disciple. See x. 7. Most of the Commentators regard his embracing Chris tianity as a mere pretence; and certain it is that he could not have regarded Jesus as the Messiah, and was guided chiefly by secular views. Mr. Scott judges more charitably and perhaps more justly.
 plain from what follows that their primary parpose was to lay hands with prayer on the new converts, and thereby impart to them the gifts of the Holy Spirit. "The Apostles (says Kin.) seem to have laid down a rule, that, after being baptized and catechised, the proselytes should have the imposition of hands, accompanied with prayer, in order to their receiving gifts of the Holy Spirit.
14. ітлитextwods] This word is used of what falls with abundance, as x.44. xi. 15. The ex-


 of this expression the Commentators are not







 єірйкате．
agreed．The most learned Interpreters regard it as a form of imprecation，and they compare the
 ö入etpov \＆c．，and the Latin pereas，abs in madam rem．And such forms are found in our own and other languages．See Johnson＇s London，i． 116 ． This interpretation，however，cannot be admitted， because in the above phrases there is a plain imprecation，either expressed，as in $\alpha \pi 0^{2}$ No to，or implied by the ellipsis of a verb of going in the Imperative；whereas here there is nothing like
 signifies＇may your money rest with yourself！＇ which（as the Optative sometimes has the force of an Imperative）means＇keep your money to yourself，＇as in a kindred passage of Joseph．

 кทTov rival；where I conjecture aùiч̣．．Neither do the words els adm cid $\lambda$ cia contain any impre－ cation，but only a warning of the consequences resulting from，by stating the tendency of，money so employed，unless averted by repentance and reformation．Of this sense of els（unto）there are examples at Rom．v．16．in els катакррца and cis ঠıкаimenv．and vi．16．dдартias（ $\tau \bar{\eta} s$ фepoúgns）els $\theta$ divaroy，＇which tends to or results in death．＇Prediction（which some recent Commentators，after Markl．，suppose）can as little be proved to be inherent in the words as imprecation．
 mode of expressing the same thought，and seems to have been a common idiom，since it occurs in Deut．x．9．\＆ii．12． 2 Sam．$x$ x．1．Job．$x$ xii． 25 ．
 pंजियa，after the example of the＇Hebr．דבר，often signify a thing．
－ $\boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \rho$ карঠ ia－$\theta$ coü $]$ Formed on 2 Kings x．15，denoting that his profession of Christianity was insincere and hypocritical，or corrupted by pursuing bye－ends．
22．al doa dфe日ウंनera، \＆ce．］El doa is by many learned Commentators taken in the sense ut，as dimes in Phil．iii．11．and sometimes in the Classical writers．And so the Heb．© si forte is rendered $7 \nu a$ by the LXX．in Exod．$x \times x i 1.30$. But to so rare a signification we need not resort， especially as it weakens the sense．The words may be taken according to their ordinary use． In order，however，to fully understand the sense， it is to be observed that el $\tilde{a} \rho a$ when occurring any where except at the beginning of a sentence， is elliptical，and some participle，usually $\pi$ ectpoi－ mevos，or such like，is to be understood．So Mark＇xi．13．el ápá evpríce ti．Acts xvii． 27.
 too，this is the case with the single al，as Earip． Heracl．640．Thus the full sense is，＇［trying］ whether＇\＆c．；and the doubt implied，as Grot． and Doddr．observe，does not respect the be－ nignity of God，but the reformation of Simon， i．e．whether his repentance of so heinous an offence would be such as to obtain the Divine pardon．
＇Exivota signifies not so much thought，as contrivance，device．The word is usually takes in a bad sense．Perhaps the term is here slightly emphatical，suggesting how heavy a guilt would have attended the execution of such a design． The next words illustrate the nature of the doubs before expressed，and show it to have rested on the state of Simon＇s heart towards God．
23．cis $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi^{0} \lambda$ riv－ínyra］The words are
 according to which，Castalio elegantly renders， －Nam te amparo file，preditum et injustitià con－ strictum esse video．＇The best Commentators， however，from Alberti and Wolf to Kuin．，have been of opinion（comparing Deut．xxix．18．with Nebr．xii．15．）that els odin is for xodriv，as Acts xiii． 22 \＆47．vii．21．Eph．ii．15．And they assign the following sense．I see thou art a most pernicious person，like to a bitter and poi－ sonous plant，a pest to Christian society．＇So Epigr．ii．11．ส $\bar{\alpha} \sigma \alpha$ xvi xi ouvicofos they take to mean a mere bundle of iniquity．＇But the soundness of this whole inter－ pretation may be questioned；for in the passages adduced the elis is for more，and there is an ellipsis of civat；which is not the case here． Besides，the style of unmeasured reproach in－ volved in $\sigma \dot{v} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \circ y$ ，if not in xo入ìm，so inter－ preted，is not characteristic of the sacred wii－ ers，whose language，like that of our Lord，is sometimes severe，but never abusive．I must therefore acquiesce in the common interpretation， which yields a sense，though strictly just，little less severe，namely，＇that thou art immersed in wickedness of the vilest sort，and fast bound in the chains of sin and Satan．＇Ede may be taken for ${ }^{2} \nu$ ，as often in the N．T．and the Classical writers．In which case civet is used in the sense to come（as here）or become；and the dis signifies at or to．Of course，xor ny is，by a common

 own unworthiness．See Joh．ix．31．By his using the plural number we may suppose that John was present．That his repentance was not real we have every reason to believe from the circumstances of the case，as well as from bia





 civoûxos，duvá

subsequent conduct，as recorded by early Eccle－ siastical tradition．
 prove on good evidence，to demonstrate and teach．
 mentators suppose this communication made by a dream．But there is nothing in the air of the passage to warrant this，and，as Storr observes， （Opusc．iii．178．）it is no wonder that Philip should have been admonished sometimes（as at $29 \& 39$ ．）by the internal suggestions of the Holy Spirit，and cometimes（as here）by the personal address of an angel ；since，in a similar case，after he had been once and again internally admonished by a vision（See Acts xvi．6．seqq．） he was at length externally admonished by a meseenger sent from God（v．10．）．See Hammond．
 Commentators are not a little perplexed．They are not agreed to what they are to be referred； some say to 「á\}ay, others to triv doóv. So littie satisfied，however，are they with either，that Wessel．，Valckn．，Hein．，and Kuin．suspect the words to be an interpolation from the margin：but of this there is not the slightest proof；and that is but culting the knot，which may，I think， be very well untied．As to the two foregoing interpretations，that which refers the words to「á̧av cannot be admitted；for，taking for granted that there were then two Gazas，New Gaza and Old Gaza，destroyed by Alexander，and here said to be＂$\rho \eta \mu \mathrm{m}$ ，yet they were so near together， that it is not likely there were two roads leading from Jerusalem to each of them respectively． Besides，why a road should be carried to a place nearly uninhabited it is not easy to see．That indeed would require，says Kuin．，the Article to eqnuos．Or rather，St．Luke would have in that case written cis Triv 「dそav ท̈Tcs ioviv ip． The latter interpretation is adopted by the best Commentators，antient and modern，（supported by the Syriac Version）who suppose that there were two roads leading from Jerusalem to Gaza， one farther about and carried along the valley of the rivulet Eshcol，the other shorter，but carried across the rough tract of mount Casius，and therefore desert and unfrequented．But that there were two，rests wholly on conjecture and thus perspicuity，and even propriety，would require ทTtcs dotiv ipquos．Yet why embarrass ourselves unnecessarily？There is no reason why we should not suppose the words to be those of St．Luke，not of the Angel，and（re－ ferring them，as we must do，to tiv dobv \＆c．） regand them as a remark of the Eivengelist，
similar to many such in the N．T．and（as I have elsewhere shown）in the Classical writers． See Job vi．10．and Note．St．Lake means to hint，that it might seem strange that one so desirous to evangelize as Philip should be sent upon so unfrequented a road as that from Jeru－ salem to Gaza．Reland，indeed，objects that there is no reason why that road should be called fipyuos any more than any other road in Judaea． But that supposes far more knowledge of the antient state of the country than we have，or is now attainable．Reland himself could not have proved that the road was not such．If it was carried in a straight course，it might have passed most of the way over a billy and barren tract， through no city or town of any note．And therefore the epithet ${ }^{\prime} p \eta \mu o v$ ，which（as I have proved by examples in Recens．Synop．）means uninhabited，i．e．very thinly peopled，would be suitable enough．

The $\& \pi l$ signifies upon，as in many other pas－ sages．See Schleus．Lex．

27．I have placed a comma after AlOioy， because divip AiO．stands for a substantive（the dyrij being almost redundant）and thus cannot well qualify civoūxos．Eùvoüxos signifies pro－ perly cubicularius，chamberlain，prefect of the bed－chamber．And as such were generally castrati，so it came to mean spado，an eunuch． And such being，for their supposed fidelity． generally promoted to other confidential court offices，hence the term came to mean，in a general way，an officer of state（so here a Trea－ surer，as we find from what follows）whether a eunuch or not．Thus Potiphar，Gen．xxxix． 1 ， though called civoūxos \＄apám，yet had a wife． $\Delta u \nu a \sigma T y s$ ．This word signifies properly one who
 Tivt in the antient writers，of which phrase I have adduced examples in Recens．Synop．The construction，however，here requires that it should be taken，not as an adjective，（with almost all Finglish Translators）but as a substantive， magnas，a grandee，as Doddr．renders：Wolf． and Wets，have proved from Pliny，Dio Cass．， and Strabo，that Candace was a family name common to the Queens of Xthiopia superior， or Meroe，like the Pharaohs in Esypt．
This person was，no doubt，a Jewish proeelyte， as appears，not so much by his reading the Prophet Isaiah，as by his coming to Jerusalem to worship there．That eunuchs were not ad－ mitted as proselytes is no proof that he wea not one，because cuvoūxos does not necessarily imply that he was an eunuch in the physical sense．











is sometimes expressed． $\mathrm{\Gamma}$ à̧a is a word of Persian origin，and signifies treaure．

28．diveyivmakc］Neatness of style and strict propriety would rather have required dyayt－ vNakwor，or the omission of the кal preceding and the $\tau e$ a little before．And one or other of the MSS．does indeed offer these emendutions； but the change is quite unneceseary．In thus reading the Scriptures，and，as it appears from the next verse，aloud on a journey，the proselyte was（See the Rabbinical citations of Schoetty．） following the directions of the Jewish Rabbies． That the pious proselyte was reading the Pro－ phet in order to see how far the circumstances which he had learned of the life，death，and resurrection of Jesus corresponded with the evangelical predictions，is a very probable sup－ position．

29．iime Td пreūna］Many antient Com－ mentators，and，of the modern ones，Bp．Pearce， take this to mean the angel mentioned at $v .26$ ． See Heb．i．14．This，however，involves some harshness；and it is better，with the most eminent modern Commentafors，to regard the words as a popular manner of expression，only denoting that such was the suggestion of the Holy Spirit，so communicated（like the afflatus of the Prophets） as that the inspired person could always distin－ guish such Divine suggestions from those of his own mind．And thus the Holy Spirit might in a certain sense be said to speak the words to him．
－ко入入 $\bar{\eta} \theta \eta \tau \iota \tau \omega \bar{\omega} \ddot{\alpha} \rho \mu, \tau$ ．$]$ Ko $\lambda \lambda \bar{a} \sigma \theta a t$ with a paseive form has（like the Hebrew conjugation Hothpahel，which is at once passive and re－ flective）a reflective sense，and signifies to attach oneself to，join company with．So the Heb． P in 2 Sam．xx． $2 ., 2$ Kings xviii．6．，Ruth 1．14．，where the LXX．use dixo入oveeiv．At
 the sense is，＇join company with my maidens．＇ The chariot is here（by an usual popularidiom） for the person in the chariot，as in the Classical writers ships are put for the sailors in them．
 mentators from Grot．downwards suppose a pa－ ronomasia like that of Julian in his laconic Epistle to Basil：＇Avéy to which the Father，with equal wit and scarcely

 masia in the present case would be frigid，and unsuitable to the gravity of the speaker，and the importance of the subject．

often）to a negative sentence omitted for bre－ vity＇s sake．This omission of short clauses boh negative and affirmative referred to by rap，is frequent in the Classical writers，and several examples are adduced by Pearce．The word． we may observe，are a modest apology for ignorance．＇ $0 \delta \eta \gamma$ ．is used in a figurative sense． （instruct）as in Ooh．xvi．13．and Ps．xxv． 5.
32．replox ${ }^{i}$ ］This word properly signifies the sum of what is contained in any book \＆ic．，but here it means a passage or section，of which sense Wets．adduces two examples from Dionys．and Artemid．；and Valckn．one from Stobæus．
 These words are taken from Is．lifi． 7 and $\varepsilon$ ， and follow the Sept．Version very exactly；the verbal discrepancies which occur being foumd in the Alexandrian and other MSS．of the Sept． Between both of these and the Hebrew there is a greater difference，but not such as materially to affect the general sense．The various modes of reconciliation are fully detailed by Townsend． who laudably endeavours to remove the discre－ pancy without resorting to any conjectural emendation of the Hebrew．But however in－ genious may be the method he adopts，it may be doubted whether that will be ratified by our great Hebraists．To entirely reconcile the dis－ crepancy is perhaps impracticable．It will，how－ ever，greatly contribute thereto if we suppose that the LXX．read בעצרי משופי．The and $I$ are easily confounded．And is might easily be lost before another $b$ ，and 1 might easily arise from the $\zeta$ following．That the LXX． had after we may infer from its beins found in the N．T．in almost every MS．This， however，involves no real discrepancy from the Hebrew；for the may be taken with the pre－ ceding quite as well as with the following word． And such，I suspect，is the true reading of the Hebrew．Whether the Hebrew had originally 2 hefore $\begin{gathered}\text { or } n \text { ，is a more doubtful case，be－}\end{gathered}$ cause $D$ may mean at，under，\＆c．See Gesen． Lex．in v．That there should be a full stop after בעצרי cannot，I think，be doubted．Thus the Hebrew may be rendered，‘So he opened not his mouth under his oppression．，From judg－ ment was he hurried off to death］．＇Bp．Lowth and Kuin．take בעצ with the words following， and render，＇By an oppreseive judgment was he cut off．＇But the Hendiadys which they sup－ pose is very harsh；and they are obliged to cancel the 1．If we were allowed to do that，the sen－ tence would proceed better without the Hen－
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diadys. But the LXX., I doubt not, had it, and attached to 7 בyp. And conjoining these words with what follows, they stumbled at usump and not knowing what to make of the frrst $\square$ in the MSS., they passed it over, and either finding an 1 after $\begin{aligned} & \text { benb in their MSS., or else supplying }\end{aligned}$ it, to make up the sense, rendered as they could, and thus gave a sense [' he was deprived of a just judgment'] very applicable to Christ, but not, 1 conceive, intended by the Prophet.
The words $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \bar{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \gamma$ veeau-aivoü. are, like the correspondent Hebrew ones of which they are a literal rendering, so obecure that the true sense cannot be fully determined. Hamm., Doddr., Kuin., and most recent Commentators take the eense to be, ' who can describe the guilt of the men of his uime (from whom he suffered such things ]?' But this is negatived by what follows. Bp. Lowth renders, ‘and his manner who would declare?' i.e. bear witnees in his favour; viz. no one; a a sense of $7 \boldsymbol{7}$ which has countenance in the Arabic. This circumstance was manifestly fulfiled in Christ; and the point of Hebrew Antiquities on which it depends is admirably illustrated by Dr. Kennicott and Bp. Iowth. The interpretation is, too, much confirmed by the words following, and is probably the true one. How applicable the whole is to Christ, is so obvious, that one cannot but wonder at the blindnees of Commentators, some of considerable eminence, who have taken any other view. The opinions of the Jewish and early Christians, here coincide, and the strongest internal evidence confirmas their judgment.
In the words ärı ácoeraに-aiooù the sense is the same as in the Hebrew ; but the Translators either read otherwise, or translated freely.
 dred paseage of Lu. xxiv. 27. T $\rho a \phi \eta$ nas used of a single pasage of scripture occurs in Mark xv. 58 . and elsewhere. In singryed iacazo aitrü 'I., which words signify. 'he nstructed him in the doctrine and principles of the religion of Jesus,' it is implied that he commenced by referring the words of the prophecy to Jesus, and from thence introduced whatever else he had to communicate. In 'Ingoùy we have the perion put for the thing, as Lu. iii. 18. Acts xvi. 10. Gal. 1. 9.1 Pet. i. 12. An idiom frequent in the Classical writers, on which see Math. Gir. Gr. $\$ 409$. \& 410. and Butum. Gir. p. 225. Eüaryed. here simply signifes to announce, proclaim.
36. Ti ubap ] Probably some fountain or pool formed by a brook either running into the

Fshcol rivulet, or formed at a bend of the Eshcol itself.
 may well infer that Philip had fully instructed the Eunuch on the nature and necessity of baptism as an initiatory ordinance of Chrstianity : nay also that the Eunuch had professed his wish to receive, and Philip his willingness to administer it at a fit opportunity. In $\tau i$ к $<\infty$ 白et; the sense must not be pressed upon; for, from the examples of that phrase, and the quid vetat or prohibet of the Latin it is probable that the sense meant to be expressed by the Eunuch was this, 'Here is an opportunity for the thing to be done forthwith.'
37. There has been no little debate as to the authority of this verse, which is not found in many of the best MSS. and most of the antient Versions, including the Syriac (Peshito), and is omitted in several citations of the Fathers, as also in the Edit. Princ. And in some of the MSS. which do contain it, it is found with marvellous diversity of reading. It is, therefore, cancelled or rejected by Grot., Mill, Wets., Pearce, Matth., Newc., Griesb., Tittm., Knapp, Kuin., Gratz, and Vat. ; but defended by Whitby and Wolf-strenuously, but not, I think, successfully. It is surely not, as Wolf contends, necessary to the context. The external testimony against it is certainly, if not equal to that for it, at least pretty strong. And internul testimony is decidedly against it; for no good reason can be imagined why it should have been thrown out, or omitted inadvertently ; whereas, for its insertion we may easily account, namely; from the anxiety of well meaning, but misjudging persons to remove what they thought an abruptness; and to check what they deemed too favourable to haste in administering baptism; as also to remove a stumbling-block from the thing not being described as done in due form. As to Whitby's argument, it has no force whatever, on the ground that the verse was probably omitted in later times, because it opposed the delay of baptism which the catechumens experienced before they were admitted into the early Church. Surely if the verse be removed, the delay of baptism would seem to be still nuore opposed. The strongest argument brought forward for the authority of the passage is that it was read by Irenæus, (see his work Adv. Hier. iii. 12. p. 196.) by Cyprian, and, as Mill and others say, by Tertullian. But upon referring to the passage de Baptismo C. 18., I find no
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Ti． 1. Tim． 1.
shadow of proof that the verse was read by him， but a probability that it was not．As to the authority of Cyprian it is not great ；for he ge－ nerally follows the Vulgate，which has the verse． And its being cited by Irenzeus will only prove the great antiquity of the passage，not its genuine－ ness．That will，however，show the caution of the primitive Church on this head，and will prove that it required，previous to the adminis－ ration of baptism to adults，an unhesitating avowal of belief in the Divinity as well as divine legation of Jesus Christ．See Doddr．
 here taken in a passive sense，＇He bid the car－ riage to be stopped．＇
－$\dot{\beta} \alpha^{\prime}$ жrıテev auróv］No doubt，with the use of the proper form ；but whether by immer－ sion，or by sprinkling，is not clear．Doddr． maintains the former，but Lardner ap．News． the latter view；and，I conceive，more properly． On both having descended into the water，Philip seems to have taken up water with his hands and poured it copiously on his head．It is，indeed， plain from various passages of the Gospels that baptism was then administered by the baptizer after having placed the person to be baptized in some river or brook；and that plenty of water was thought desirable，see Joh．iii．23．But though this may seem to favour immersion，yet the other method might as well be adopted． Water might，indeed，be fetched in a vessel for the purpose of pouring it on the head of the per－ son．Yet that it should not，may be accounted for by a reference to the climate，customs，and opinions of the people of Palestine，without rem－ dering it necessary to suppose that nothing but a purpose of immersion could originate the custom for the baptizer and the baptized to both go into water of some depth．

39．туєüца Kupiou ท̈praбє тд̀ Ф．］In some antient MSS．and late Versions are inserted be－ tween rveeupa and Kupiov the words alyson
 de：which reading is approved by Hamm．and Towns．；but without reason；for it is a manifest interpolation of those who thought the snatching up of Philip more suitable to an angel than to the Holy Spirit．And there might be some ground for this，if we were to understand，with several Commentators，as Doddr．and Scott， that Philip as caught np and carried through
the air supernaturally；for examples of which they refer to 1 Kings xviii．12． 2 King ii． 16. Ezek．iii．14．There is，however，no necessity to suppose that to be the case here．Nay，ac－ cording to Bp．Middleton＇s Canon，the persons！ sense here in xveīma is inadmissible；while，as Mr．Rose observes on Parkh．p．700．，if ipracr be translated＇caught away，＇it seems required． I quite agree with Mr．Rose that nothing mi－ raculous is here intended．＂Horace may vert well be understood of the imperative suggestions of the Holy Spirit，which Philip doubtless well knew how to distinguish from the motions of his own mind．The meaning，therefore，seems to be that assigned by Mr．Rose，as follows －Philip went away quickly under the direction and influence of the Spirit．And I would com－ pare Herodot．iv．13．＂Eфף de＇Apıorégs－גंтt－
 $\mu \in y o s$. The strong term $\eta_{j} \rho \pi \alpha \sigma \in$ might，indeed． seem selected to suggest the unvillingraess with which Philip must have torn himself away from this promising convert．Perhaps，however，no more may be meant than＇hurried him away，＇ as alpert is sometimes used of the influence of the Holy Spirit in the LXX．，as 1 Kings xviii． 12．val тveìma Kvpiou dpeī ae els riv jivy ท゙y oúk oloza．and 2 Kings ii．16．ми́ тоте per


40．cuspid $\eta$ els＂AY．］The rendering inventus est，was found，is so unsatisfactory，that mort re－ cent Commentators adopt the version of Drusius flit，extitit，was，or abode，of which．sense they adduce examples．But I prefer，with Bess，to suppose that the passive is used in a reciprocal or reflective sense，as in French il se trouva stands for il fut trouve，made his appearance．There is an imitation of the Hebrew idiom by which pas－ give forms often have a reciprocal sense，as мymu． And so even in Greek．Thus in Herodot．iv． 4. we have the similar expression фavévra aürdy is Mрокоуу．The air of the expression seems to refer to the rapt feeling with which Philip left the eunuch and went to Azotus．
 ＜$\mu \pi \nu \in \dot{c} \omega \nu$ can mean＇breathing out threatening，＇ nor even iкл⿰亻écov．And he would conjecture $\frac{d}{} \mu \pi \lambda$ cocos．But no alteration is necessary．${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{B}_{\mu \pi}$－ veīv signifies to inhale and exhale breath by the nostrils，to breathe．Now to do this with quick－ ness and vehemence implies strong passion，es．












pecially anger. In the later Greek writers the word denoting the kind of passion is expreseed in the Genit., by an ellipee of $\dot{d} \pi{ }^{2}$, signifying origin, cause, \&c. In the earlier writers the Accus. is used.

 Article may be put for the Pronoun demonstrative, as Joh. vii. 17. "Odos denotes not only a veay of life, but uay of thinking, (as Judith v.8.
 sect, either in philosophy, (as Suid. in v. ' ${ }^{\mathbf{B}} \mu \pi \mathrm{c}$ doк $\lambda \bar{\eta} s$, and Lucian Herm. p. 577.) or in religion, as here and in xxii. 4. тaírny Tiv̀ ósov IdimEa. \& xxiv. 14. From the populousness of Damascus, and its constant communication with Jerusalem, and being, probably, the place whither most of those who fled at the murder of Stephen took refuge, the number of Christians was likely to be considerable. So great was the authority of the Sanhedrim with the foreign Jews that they readily submitted to its decrees in matters spinitual, as for instance the suppression of what was esteemed heresy, especially as the then Ruler of Damascus, Aretas, King of Arabia, was either, according to some, a Jevish proselyte, or at least was well affected to the Jews, and admittel the exercise of this authority in things spiritual.
3. On the subject of the conversion of St . Paul, I cannot too strongly reprobate the hypothesis of certain foreign Theologians who, building on the half developed views of De Dieu, Elin., and Hamm., regard the circumstances of the care as by no means miraculous, but as produced solely by cerain terrific natural phenomena, which they suppose had such an effect on the high wrought imagination, and so struck the conscience of Saul, as to make him view as a reality what was merely produced by fancy. I have at large considered, and, I trust, thoroughly confuted this notion in Recens. Synop., the following extracts from which must here suffice. " It were surely inconsistent with ingenuousness and truth to dreas up vivid imprescions of the mind, caused by natural phenomena, in a dramatic style, and manufacture them into a dialogue. Paul, however ardent might be his temperament and vivid his imagination, could not so far deccive himself as to suppose that the
conversation (related by him at large in his speech before Agrippa) really took place, if there had been no more than these Commentators tell us. Besides, he is so minute as to say it was in the Hebrew language; and the address, as given most in detail at C. 26 ., is a somewhat long one. Moreover, if he were so worked upon by his own high wrought feelings and tender conscience, that could not be the case with his attendants: and yet it is said that 'they also, struck dumb with astonishment, heard the voice, though they saw no one.'"

Many of the objections made to the common view, may be avoided by not contending (as we are by no means obliged to do) for the corporeal presence of Jesus Christ. Besides, if фeovi be taken (though no proof of such a sense is established) to denote thunder, what more absurd than "I heard a clap of thunder saying ?" And his fellow travellers, on hearing the - what? the clap, and seeing no one [whom could they have expected to see?] were mute with astonishment. Moreover, $\phi$ ws is no where used of lightning; nor is lightning any where said терıабтра́жтеı. Finally, when we are told that this фwe exceeded the brightness of the midday sun, how can it be understood of lightning? The light was doubtless meant to represent the Schechinah.
5. $\sigma \kappa \lambda \eta \rho \delta \nu-\lambda a \kappa x . \int$ a proverbial form common both to the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin (as appears from the abundant examples adduced by the Commentators), and little needing explanation. I must not omit to observe, that the words $\sigma \times \lambda \eta \rho d r-\pi \rho d s$ aürds are not found in a considerable number of the best MSS. and Versions, including the Syr. Peshito ; nor in several citations of the Fathers, nor in the Ed. Pr.; and they are rejected by almost every Critic of eminence from Erasmus, Beza, and Grot. down to Tittm. and Vat. Notwithstanding what Wolf urges in defence of the passage, there can be little doubt that it was introduced from the parallel passages at xxii. 10. \& xxvi. 14. It might well be expected that the historian should be less circumstantial than the personal narrator of facts. When the passage in question was brought in, the $\alpha \lambda \lambda a$ was sure to be ejected, as worse than useless.
7. ciorixicioav evveoi] As this seems at van








fiance with the words mávtco катaтecóvтcos $\dot{\gamma} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ els $\gamma^{-j}$ in the account of his conversion by St. Paul himself to Agrippa, Acts xxvi. 14., several expedients have been devised to remove the discrepancy. The most approved one is that of Villa and others, who suppose that they had first fallen down and then risen again. But though this is preferable to that of Beza and others, who remove the difficulty by almost silencing the ciorvicetoav, explaining it were; yet it is liable to several objections, which I have urged in Recens. Synop. It should seem that the best solution will be to suppose that Paul's companions at first stood fixed and mute with astonishment, and then, struck with awe at what they regarded as indicating the presence, however invisible, of a supernatural Being, fell with their faces to the ground, as Saul had done. 'Evveol, 'mute,' and, by implication, senseless. The word denotes not so much one who is dertitute of the natural faculty of speech or hearing, as one in whom it is suspended, or accidentally lost.
 variance with the account at xxii. 9. rd $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$
 тoù $\lambda a \lambda$ oüvtós $\mu o u$. See various modes of removing the discrepancy stated and discussed in Recens. Synop. I am still of opinion that the most satisfactory one is to take ฑn^ovoav, with Grot., Bowyer, Kin., and Schleus., in the sense understood, a signification of the word often occurring in the N. T. This signification and construction is found sometimes in the Classical writers, and often in the LXX. One very apposite example will suffice. Gen. xi. 7. ouyx́mpev



They heard the sound of the voice which addressed Saul, but did not, it seems, fully understand the sense of what they heard, either from imperfect acquaintance with the Hebrew language, or rather because the words would not to them carry their meaning so plainly as to the conscience-stricken Saul. Possibly, too, the words might be pronounced in a low tone, as meant only for saul.
8. oúdéva $\left.{ }^{2} \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon\right]$. The ovóéva is not to be taken of Jesus, (for it has not been before said that Saul saw Jesus) but of the companions of Saul. In fact, the words are, as Kin has seen, a phrase denoting to be blind, as is plain from the words which follow, xeiparco रṑvтes- $-\mu \dot{\eta}$ $\beta \lambda$ érenv. That on rising and opening his eyes, he had lost the power of seeing any one, whether Jesus or his companions, is also clear from xxii.
 фwitos incivou: where, from the context, it is
obvious that the sense is : " having been Nim it: by that glorious light.'

On the blindness of Saul the Commentary: before mentioned exert themselves to exclude i: supernatural agency; but in vain. See Rect; Synop. The most plausible view taken in :in hypothesis is to consider it as temporary una: rosis, as the medical writers call it, such a: induced by excess of light. This, homer: leaves many difficulties unsolved. i. How : : consistent with what we read further on, the scales had grown over the eyes? 2. T: amaurosis is, as they themselves show, an as:ion which lasts but a retry shore time; wheres. the blindness continued about three days: How are we to account for a blindness so eveplate as to be accompanied with scales over tr eyes leaving Saul so soon, nay immediately is Ananias's laying his hands on him. 4. How: it that Saul alone, and none of his companiv: were struck with this amaurosis?
The éjyjred Xetpaywhous at Acts xiii. 11. mas? be compared with the xelpayoüvtes aired cire rayon here; a circumstance introduced to show utter blindness, and which often occurs in tie Classical writers. It should seem that in tho case of Saul, as in that of Flymas, the blindosis was not only judicial, but typical and emblem. tical. In the former case it was probably meant. by withdrawing his attention from externs; thoughts, and turning them inward, to favor reflection and self-examination, and lead to repentane.
9. ìmépas tets] Perhaps we are not to understand three complete days, but to suppose that among these three days is to be reckoned that on which Saul reached Damascus, and that on which Ananias came to him and removed his blindness. Thus when it is said that Christ was in the sepulchre three days, we know it was, in effect, but one whole day and a part of two others.

- oùk É¢ayev oùde éxtev] We might in any other case understand this of extreme abstinence. But to suppose it here, with several recent Commentators, were an unwarrantable lowering of the sense, as indeed in most of the passages to which they appeal as examples of this hyperbole. Complete fasting was very suitable under Saul's present awful visitation, which he could not know would ever be removed. Indeed the terror and remorse he felt, and the total absorption of his mind on a new and momentous subject, with the exercise of self-examination and earnest prayer for mercy and pardon, would leave him no inclination to eat and drink for the time mentinned, even had not his body been too disordered to admit of it.
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11．Eu̇eciav］I have so edited，with Beza， Wets．，and others，for $\dot{\dot{v} \theta ., \text { because the word is }}$ evidently a substantive and proper name．Many examples might be adduced from the Classical writers confirming this．One must suffice． Dionys．Hal．T．i．160．where he mentions тdv Kúmpiov arévตтov．
－Eaviov סv．］Sub．aydoa，and perhaps ка－入oúmevov．The manner in which Saul is men－ tioned here and at $v, 13$ ．quite discountenances the conjecture of many recent Foreign Commen－ tators，that Saul and Ananias were acquainted with each other．I have in Recens．Synop． shown how unfounded is this notion，and how many difficulties are created by the attempt to reduce every thing to the level of common oc－ currence，or sometimes even to intermix the ordinary and extraordinary．

12．dvós．A．］i．e．whom he understood to be by name Ananias．

13．$\dot{d}^{\prime}$ Av．］A few antient MSS．and early Edd． omit the Article，which is cancelled by almost all Editors from Matth．to Vater；but without reason． Its insertion is agreeable to strict propriety．See Middl．Gr．A．Ch．iv．And it is far more likely that the Scribes should inadvertently omit than insert it．
－tois dyions oov］A periphrasis simply denoting Christians，as the Jews were styled סunp．Both expressions denote what is sup－ posed to be the case in persons so designated，and suggest what they ought to be．
14．wobe］＇in this place．＇So Hebr．xiii．4．ov

15．aкev̄os dк入oyท̄s］A Hebraism for ox． dк入extón，a chosen instrument to work my pur－ poses．．For though oxevios（as also the Hebr． ${ }^{3}$ ）properly denotes an utensil，or piece of fur－ miture，yet，like כל in Is．xiii．5．，it sometimes denotes $\delta_{\rho \gamma a v o v, ~ i n ~ b o t h ~ i t s ~ l i t e r a l ~ a n d ~ m e t a-~}^{\text {a }}$ phorical sense，i．e．a person well adapted to the execution of any purpose．Thus Polyb．cited

 $\mu i a \nu$.
－$\beta a \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma a!]$ There is a significutio pragnans， the word signifying to carry［forth］and make known．＇Eyvasy кal ßaбt入．，＇Gentile nations， and their Kings＇or rulers．

16．$d \gamma \omega \dot{0} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \& c$ ．］The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ seems to refer to a clause omitted，and the sense may be thus more fully expressed：＇［Go，I say，fearlessly；］for ［though］I will show how much he must suffer for the profession of my religion，［yet he will continue stedfast］．＇To avoid what may seem a harshness in supposing so much sense to be left unexpressed，some of the Commentators resort to other methods，but far more open to objection． See Recens．Synop．Jesus does not actually bid Ananias to lay his hands upon Saul：but that was implied，and Ananias could not but perceive that the affair was to take place in coincidence with the vision．Hence he tells Saul that the Lord hath sent him for that purpose．
 indeed told Ananias this，but he well knew it was impossible that Saul could be able to effect what he was to effect without a copious effusion of the Holy Spirit，which is implied in the term mino－日ท̣̂s．
 supernatural power could produce this？It is pitiable to see the miserable straights to which those Commentators are reduced，who seek to account for this on natural principles．See Recens．Synop．Nothing can be plainer than that St．I．uke means to represent the removal of the blindness，as he had done the infliction of it， as supernatural．It may not be the less true that there is a disorder of the eyes，sometimes occur－ ring in the East，called 入еи́кшша（the whites） produced by certain humours in the eyes，which becoming concrete，form as it were，scales．Thus Schleus．refers to Tob．ii．9．\＆vi．10．，and cites
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Foes. Econ. Hipp. p. 230. But this, as I learn, is a lingering disorder. And to bring it on suddenly and without a natural cause, and to remove it suddenly and alike without a natural cause, cannot but be supernatural.
19. ウj $\mu$ épas tivás] Not certain days, but some days. On the chronological difficulty supposed to be involved in this and the following verses, see Kuin. in Recens. Synop. A more satisfactory solution, however, will be found in the Note on Gal. i. 17. of the present work.
20. dxyipugas tdv $x \rho$.] 13 MSS., most of the Versions, and Irenæus, have 'Infouv, which is preferred by Grot., Mill, and Beng, and edited by Griesb., Knapp, and Tittm., with the approbation of Michaefis, Morus, Valckn., Rosenm., and Kuin. The preference, however, зeems due to xpıordy, as being the more difficult reading : whereas the former bears the stamp of emendation upon it. The corruption may be attributed to those who stumbled at $\tau \delta \nu \quad \chi \rho$., taking it only to denote the same thing with wiò roū $\theta \in o \bar{u}$, and not being aware that rò $\boldsymbol{x} \rho$.
 sometimes only a proper name even in the Gospels and Acts, has been proved by Bp. Middl. See Note on Mark xi. 43., where Middl. observes, after Campb., that the commonness of the name Jesus among the Jews both rendered an addition necessary, and also contributed to the gradual substitution of that addition for the real name. Thus all objection is removed, $\mathbf{X} \rho$. being equivalent to 'I $\eta \sigma o \check{\nu}$.
K $\eta \boldsymbol{j} \dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma \in \iota \nu$ here signifies 'to publicly make known, declare any one's claims.
21. $\delta$ тop $\theta$ ij $\sigma a s$ ] 'he who vexed and persecuted to destruction.'
22. $\sigma \cup \mu \beta ı \beta a ́\} \omega v]$ 'evincing,' as in 1 Cor. ii. 16. The word properly signifies to put together, as carpenter's work or joinery. And since he who proves any thing does it by showing the connexion and tracing the chain of facts or circumstances, so it comes to mean to demonstrate, a sense which occurs in 1 Cor. ii. 16. and sometimes in the LXX.; but very rarely in the Clasgical writers. One example is adduced by the Commentators from Ocell. Luc. 'O xpiords
should be rendered 'the Messiah;', for herer $r$ is plainly an appellatioe, descriptive of tivi office. See Note supra v. 20.
24. $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu \dot{\omega} \dot{\sigma} \theta \eta-a \dot{\nu} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \text { ] This clanse perturbe it }\end{gathered}$ construction, and is removed by the Syr. Versic and Wakef,, and placed after maperipoun- ar $\lambda \omega \sigma \sigma$. That, however, is scarcely allowable eres in a Translation. In preferance to supposing it very harsh a transposition, 1 would regard ix clause, with Newc., as parenthetical. But tbo rapetripouy is brought into the cloest ans. nexion with of 'Ioudaiou as its Nominative. And the statement runs counter to that in 2 Cor. x 32. where St. Paul says not that the Jews, bx: that the soldiers of the Ethnarch of King Arese occupied the gates, that he might not escap. Nor can we understand the Ethnarch of be Jeus. The Commentators, indeed, as Kuin. attempt to remove this discrepancy by supposing either that the Jews may be said to havedort what they did by another, they having suggetus the thing; or that the Jews, by the authonty of the Ethnarch, watched the gates in conjunctim with the soldiers. Of these two solutions the second is preferable; but it may be doubted whe. ther it be quite satisfactory. I would rathe suppose that oi 'Iovodaio is not the true Nomin.
 by a very common ellips. Thus the sense may be expressed as if the verb had been impersonil. ' A watch was set at the gates, that he might be apprehended.' Thus the discrepancy will be effectually removed. It was not likely that the Governor of the city should suffer a few lavies

25. каӨ $\bar{\eta} \kappa \pi \nu$ dıà той тeixous] E.V.' by the wall,' i.e. as Doddr. and Wakef. more persp. cuously translate, ' by the side of the wall.' It id not easy, however, to gee how this could be done; and from a comparison with the perallel passage at 2 Cor. xi. 33. cal $\delta \iota \alpha$ Ovplior, it is plain that dca must here mean through, i.e. by
 $\kappa a \theta \bar{\eta} \kappa a \nu$ à̇т $\dot{C}$, and elsewhere. The Philological Commentators here fail us; though I hare in Recens. Synop. supplied the deficiency by citations from Aristoph. Vesp. 354 \& 379 ., Ather.
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p．214．，Palæphatus $\$ 9$ ．and Procop．p．155．， whence it appears this was often done．We are not，however，to understand by the $\begin{aligned} & \text { veidoc above }\end{aligned}$ mentioned a window in the wall itself（for the ex－ ceedingly thick city walls of the antients scarcely admitted of windows），but some turret on the wall，or perhaps a window of some house con－ nected with the wall，so as to have part of the house above it．For it is cerrain that this was sometimes the case，as is clear from Thucyd． ii．4．and the paseages of the Classical writers cited by me in the Note there．It may be added， that this was an Eartern custom exceedingly antient，as appears from Josh．ii．15．（of Rahab and the spies）where the Greek Translators rea－

 Rabbinical writer cited by Wets．on 2 Cor．xi． 33．＂Domus in moenibus exstructa，cujus paries exterior eat murus urbis．＂
26．тараүеvóмеvor－els＇Iep．］Not imme－ diately，but after having gone（for the second time， 1 t should seem ）into Arabia．See Note on Gal． i．17．This circumstance St．Luke omits，because （as Hasselaar with great probability supposes）he only meant to narrate such parts of St．Paul＇s history as especially illustrated the providence of God over him，and the mode in which he was brought to apply himself to the conversion of the Gentiles．

27．Bapudfas $\delta t]$ Paul is supposed to have been previously known to Baraabes，nay，to have been a fellow disciple with him under Gamaliel． ＇втлаводеvor．The older Commentators inter－ pret this＇taking him ；＇by which it will be a mere pleonasm．And for the sense＇received him into hospitality，＇aseigned by Schleus．and others，there is no authority．It seems to de－ note（by an idiom common to our own language） ＇taking him by the hand，＇i．e．giving him his countenance，society，and aid．Thus the Syriac Version expreseses it by＇accepit；＇better succopit． This sipnification is rare ；but there is an example


 dnotageotat Iv \＆c．here and at Eph．vi． 20. signifises to＇use freedom and boldness respecting or on account of Jesus，＇i．e．his religion，for its promotion．So Joh．xiv．13． 8 rı àv aitiofure

 is a phrase expressive of familiarity and intimacy． See i．21．The construction here（unnoticed by the Commentators）is as follows：кal ${ }^{\circ} \nu \mu \mathrm{\mu er}$
 repeat $\tilde{\eta}_{\nu}$ ；for the sense is not，I conceive，as Wakef．thought，that Saul used much freedom of speech with the Apostles，though that is coun－ tenanced by the Vulgate；but it is meant to be asserted that he did the same at Jerusalem that

 well seen by the antient Syriac translator）and thus connects well with didi入ec and ouveそjiret following．

29．d入aंगet кal $\sigma v y$ ．］A sort of Hendiadys．
30．גтгyvovres］Sub．тоüto．The ellip．is frequent in the best writers，especially Thucyd． Kavijacyov．This may have reference to the situation of C onea on the sea－coast，as com－ pared with the upland region of Damascus．So кace入өeiv at v． 32 ．It may，however，signify ＇conducted him，＇as in Thucyd．iv．78．ol \＆$\%$ wo yol－кarécтntay airdy is $\Delta i ̃ o$ ．and Acts
 ＇A0 ${ }^{2}$ should take the Carea here of Cesarea Philippi， since（as Calmet well observes）when Czesarea is mentioned without any addition，it means Cesarea of Pelestine．There is nothing in Gal． $\mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{o}}$ 21．to compel us（as Doddr．imagined）to sup－ pose the former；since els there does not mean （when，indeed，does it？）through，but unto． And the expression eis $\tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \lambda / \mu a t a$ Evplas would only induce us to suppose，that after having taken ship at Cxsarea，Saul did not go to Tarsus by crossing the sea ；but went thither， as in his later voyages，by taking coasting ves－ sels，and stopping at the principal maritime cities of Syria，as Laodicea，Antioch，and per－ hape proceeding from the latter place to Tarsus by land，through Upper Syria and Cilicia Cam－ pestris．He took this course，probably，in order to spread the Gospel over the flourishing and populous commercial places all along that coast， and especially among the Hellenists．Wheresa， if he had gone by land from Casarea Philippi， he would have traversed a mountainous and thinly inhabited country，almort entirely peo－ pled by heathena．






















31．olкидорои́мєval］We have here an arch－ tectural metaphor；though the Commentators are not agreed whether it should be taken in the physical sense，of increase in number of persons， or metaphorically，of increase in spiritual know－ ledge and the grace of God．The former is mostly adopted by the older；but the latter，by the recent Commentators，which is preferable， being supported by a multitude of passages of the N．＇I．，and far more agreeable to the con－ struction．

33．Alvéay］From the name，he seems to have been an Hellenist，and，as the air of the passage seems to suggest，a Christian．Kataкeíneyov $d \pi i$ к $\alpha \beta \beta$ ．Perhaps we need not suppose that he had been literally ten years laid on a bed，but that he had been ten years bedridden．

34．$\sigma$ т $\rho \bar{\omega} \sigma o \nu$ बeavтü］This expression，like кoîtoy toleĩo日at in Herodot．vii．17．，has refer－ ence not to such portable couches as cripples were laid upon，to excite charity，but to a bed of large size，and suited to AEneas＇s respectable situation in life．

35．oitıves dтé taters，as Peace，Wakef．，Heinr．，and Kin． take éxéot．in a pluperfect sense，had turned， rendering：＇and all the inhabitants of Lydda and Saron who had turned to the Lord saw him．＇ But that yields a very awkward sense，as if no others had seen the person when healed but the Christian converts．Whereas all must have seen him．And that is what St．Luke seems to have meant to say；and after that to describe the effect which the miracle had on the inhabitants of the
place where it was worked，and its district． Comp．v．42．The oircucs here has，in strict： ness，the force of a relative；but it may（as te relative os often is）in translation be resolves into its equivalent cal and èкeivos．In fact，re－ latives in most languages are compounded of such，as，for instance，qui of que and ille，and quid from $q^{u i}$ and is．As to the relative os，it was formed from the demonstrative os，with the clips．of the conjunction．The usage fat under the rule of Math．Gr．Gr．$\$ 477$ ．＂C The relative sometimes serves，as in Latin，is connect propositions，instead of the demonstra－ live．＂
36．$\pi$ rip ${ }^{2}$ s．$\alpha$ ．$¢$ ．］＇abounding in，studious of
 $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta$ ias．Acts vi． 3.
37．入oüvaytes $\dot{\text { de }}$ auviǹ ］As we cannot sup－ pose that men would do such an office，（though there are passages in Herodotus which prove that it was in Egypt performed by men－undertakers） we may，with Peace and Mark．，take $\lambda$ oi－ aves as put for $\lambda$ oúvagat，by reference to $\dot{\boldsymbol{a}} \nu \theta$ риттot understood，that being a general term． including females．In fact it may stand for an impersonal，and the sense be＇she was washed and laid out．＇
38．$\mu$ i＇$\dot{\kappa} \nu \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma a t$ ］＇not to delay．＇$A$ sense rare in the earlier，but frequent in the later writers．The Commentators cite examples from Joseph．，Dig．Laert．，Galen，and the Sept．It is，however，of more importance to observe，that we may hence clearly infer they had a hope of Peter＇s being able to bring the dead person to life．
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- ̇̇тideıкvíncyat- Dopкás] The sense (grievously mistaken by Wakef.) seems to be: 'Showing coats and garments such as Dorcas used to make when she was with them.' The use of the Imperfect to denote custom is not unfrequent. The expression civat $\mu e \tau \alpha$ tivos is one of the many euphemisms on the subject of death, such as abound both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. So Eurip. Ald. 1004. dina
 Bavoüra. It is not certain whether the garments shown were, as the common opinion is, stocks of clothes provided for the poor, or such as the widows had then on, as the recent Commentators suppose. The latter opinion is confirmed by the ancient Syriac Version.
 ix. 25 . and compare 2 kings iv. 33.
 elegance in this use of mapiornut, of which Wets. adduces an example from Sext. Emp. 254. öтe



43. Tana'] Not 'with,' but 'in the house of,' as the French say cher soi; there being an ellip. of छevi̧ónevos, which is expressed a little further on, and is here found in the antent Syr.
X. 1. $\sigma$ теip chiefly formed of Italians ; for most of the Roman corps in Syria and Palestine were composed of provincials. Gruter's Inscriptions mention an Italian cohort, as do also Arrian, Josephus, and

Dio Cast. Some think this cohort was the body guard of the Roman governor.

With respect to Cornelius, it has been debated whether he was a Gentile, or a Jewish Proselyte. Commentators are now generally agreed on the former : (see, however, the able Dissertation of Mr. Towns., who maintains the latter) but though a Gentile, a worshipper of the one true God, and most probably the first-fruits of the conversion of the Gentiles.
4. $\tau i ́ \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \leqslant \star \dot{v} \rho t \epsilon]$ A popular form of respectfut answer to the call of a superior, though sometimes to that of an inferior, varying according to the tone of voice with which it is propounced. Kin. aptly cites Fisth.v.1. Ti dorty 'Eб日rín; So also Fish. v. $6 \& 7$. vii.2. Ti dative
 Thus there is an ellips. of some such word as aIT $\boldsymbol{\pi} \mu \alpha$ or $\beta$ oú入ŋгเs.

- duéß here and at v.31. is only an Oriental and figurelive way of expressing that any thing has come to the knowledge of God. Nor does it necessarily imply the Jewish notion, that men's prayers are carried up by angels to God in Heaven. In els $\mu \nu \eta \mu$. we have the Hellenistic use of $\mu \nu \eta \mu \delta$ lvov for $\mu \nu \eta \mu \in i o v, ~ c o r r e s p o n d i n g ~ t o ~ t h e ~ H e b . ~$ rory. The word almost always implies, as here, an honourable remembrance; and els $\mu \nu \eta \mu$. here and at Matt. xxvi. 13. seems put for cere $\mu \nu \eta \sigma-$ өท̄vas.

5. cal $\nu \bar{u} v]$ A hortatory form, of which examples are adduced by Elan.












6．Eevi［̧erat］This is well explained by Hesych．Eevodoxeitat．That sense（which oc－ curs elsewhere in the Acts and in the Epistle to the Hebrews，）is almost confined to the later writers．See the learned Note of Valckn．Bop－ wei，tanner， 2 word coming from the old French tainier from teindre，to stain．The Attic writers， however，expressed this sense by ßupaodé $\Psi \boldsymbol{\eta}$ s， corresponding to our currier．With them $\beta$ pop－ Gris only denoted a skinner，though there can be little doubt but that，among the antients，the two trades were often conjoined，as far as the roughest sorts of tanning were concerned；and both were proverbially mean occupations，and held in such contempt by the Jews，that various laws were in force with reference thereto．See Rec．Syn．Thus the house being by the sea－side was in conformity to a law which obliged tanners to have their work－shops outside of towns．They were always placed near rivers，or by the sea，for the convenience of water，so necessary for their trade．
－oüros－roteiv］These words are omitted in many of the best MSS．，Versions，and Fathers， with the Edit．Princ．，and are written so very differently in others，that almost all Critics，Com－ mentators，and Editors are agreed that they are from the margin，introduced from ix．6．x． 32. xi．14．xxii． 10.
7．Tఱ̄ท троокарт．a．］Pric．，Schleus．，and Kin．take $\pi \rho о \sigma к а \rho т$ ．to mean＇of those who stood sentry，＇or，＇of his body guard．＇But there in perhaps no reason to abandon the common version＇of those who waited upon him，＇namely， an domestics；for it seems that centurions were allowed to use some of their soldiers in that capacity ；which is also．I believe，in some med－ nurse the custom of modern times．This sense is confirmed by the use of the word supra viii．13， and in perhaps required by the excivcoy at v． 10 ． where nee Note．

10．mpógretvos］A．word said to occur no－ where else，though кaтdizecvos，iкжetvos，and
 nine force，as derived from the signification in addition to．I know no other example of this with un adjective，except it be xpoonvyis．At
 should suppose would be used solely of taking a slight refreshment；but it is very often used of biking a meal，without reference to any quantity
of food eaten．See my Note on Thucyd．E； The Classical writers rarely，if ever，use 12 word thus，absolutely；in which we may ra－ to the force of the middle voice，by wt： the word means to feed oneself，and thence cat．
10．ixeivan］Several MSS．and Origen ban： aücuiv，which seems to have greater proprie－ since íceivos is rarely found in this absolute br but it is perhaps an emendation，especially ai？ comes from a quarter fruitful in such．Beat－－ dx cíycov may even have greater propriety，if w： consider it as having reference to the rain $\pi$ per картеройутши аїтӧ supra จ． 8.
－exotagts］The word properly signifies： removal of any thing from any former situation ： state；but it is here applied to that remora the mind from the body，by which，even thous： awake，we are insensible to external objet： around us，and our senses are so far from cos－ vexing to us the impressions of external object． that the mind seems，as it were，to have retires from the body，and to be wholly absorbed in ti： contemplation of mental images，and sometime－ is rapt into visions of future and invisible thine： We may render，＇an ecstasy＇or trance．Listir． observes that there were seven ways in whir： God formerly revealed himself to men ；1．bi dreams；2．by apparitions while they were awake；3．by visions while they slept ；4．by 2 voice from Heaven；5．by the Urim and Thurs－ mim ；6．by inspiration，or auricular revelation 7．by a sort of rapture or ecstasis，（as here and Gen．ii．21．）which was of all the other mode－ the most excellent，by which a man seas snatch； into Hearer（2 Cor．xii．2．）and mes in the Spirit： （Rev．i．10．）．
11．бкeйós］The word（derived from oxefo．or xéw，lego）signifies any article of furniture which is adapted to contain any thing，a vessel．＇OOjmp． The word may mean either a sheet，or a scraper． such as has ever been in use in the East to chron over．This signification is recognised by the Greek Lexicographers，and is found in Aristoph．Veep．
 xıт由̀vas．Of this word the etymon is given up by the Etymologists．But may it not come from $\delta \theta \omega$ ，cognate with ow and otis，to hear or carry ； as our sheet comes from the ing．Sax．shetan， to cast or throw［over］．It is of the same form as opevióvn，dy Xóvn，тepóv，ße入óvn \＆cc．，in




which words we may discover a similarity in the ratios sik＂ifirationis．

On the typical intent of this and other parts of the vision sec Town end．
－d $\rho$ ais］＇A $\rho \chi^{n}$ n signifies the ettremit！＂of any thing of an oblong form，since each end nay be considered as a beginning．See Galen ap． Recens．Synop．And as in things of the form of a parallelogram（as in a web of cloth）each end， having two angles，may be said to have two of these ap $\alpha$ ai ；thus ap $a$, might here be rendered extremities，or corners；though＇ends＇is the more accurate version．Wakef．，indeed，renders by four strings，referring for an example of that signification，to a passage of Dior．Sic．Bp． Niddlet．regards this as＂a singularly happy cri－ ticism，and as probably worth all that remains in his New Testament．＂I can neither agree with the l＇relate in his commendation，nor by any means（low as I rate the value of Wakefield＇s la－ bours on the N．＇I．）in the censure which it implies． After carefully examining all the authorities which have any bearing upon the point in ques－ ton，I cannot discover any proof of the significa－ ion which Wakef．and Middle．adopt．The pas－ sages to which I allude are the following．Galen de Chirurg．ii．Exod．xxviii．23．（Complut．）


 row $\alpha \rho \chi \alpha$ s．But the first and second passages only prove that either，or both ends of any oblong body might be called $\alpha \rho$ xci．The rest show that it was not unfrequently used of the end of a rope or band．On which see Jacobs on Anthol．Gr．T． xi．p． 50 ．So far，the proof only amounts to this，－that d $\rho \times{ }^{r}$ may denote the end of any thing，and，with the addition of a word signifying band，the end of a rope；but there is no proof that it ever meant a rope．Yet the package of Died．Sic．cited by Waken．，T．i．104．Fit．Blip．， was thought by Middl．to supply this proof．It respects the manner of harpooning the limpopo－ tamis，and the words are these：ci 日＇evil tin

 Grecian，Weaseling，in his Note，determines it to mean＂hempen cable－ends．＂These were pro－ bably stronger than the rest of the cable；and they were，no doubt，fastened together for the purpose of holding fast the Hippopotamus；hence the plural is used．Of this sense of aipxp to denote end Wessel．adduces two examples from Plutarch and Philo Jud．And finally，he so ex－ plains the present passage of Acts．Hochart， indeed，most ingeniously，conjectures on the pas－ sage of Did．oxajetas or $\alpha \rho \tau \alpha \dot{\nu} a s$ ，which had also occurred to myself；but they are perhaps unnecessary，if the above mode of explanation be adopted．At all events，there is no proof made out that $\alpha^{\rho} \rho \chi^{r}$ can of itself denote a rope．Indeed such a usage would involve an intolerable rata－ chresis．The two learned Critics above men－
toned were both deceived by not attending to the nature of the word $\delta \in \delta \in \mu \in \nu o \nu$ ，which is often， as here，a cor pragnans，including the sense ind or is $\sigma$ Xolvivu．To Matt．xxi．12．єipríere óvov
 In this case the $\dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{c}$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ must be understood according as the sense be suspension from（as in the present passage），or tying $t a$ ，as in the fore－ going．Thus we may render＇at the four ends；＇ for the sense cannot be＇by four rope－ends．＇ Midill．，indeed，objects to the introduction of the the，because there is no article in the Greek；for－ getting that he thus falls into the very error for which he so often censures Wakef．，that of not bearing in mind those many cases where the absence of the Article affords no presumption of the noun＇s being indefinite．The present falls under the case of nouns used car $\epsilon \xi \circ \chi \eta \nu$ ，or rather nouns which，though by their very defi－ nite sense，they point only to certain individuals of a genus，yet that is so well understood，that the Article may be safely omitted．And this is still more frequently the case when the noun is accompanied with an adjective，and preceded by a preposition．Here $\varepsilon^{2} \pi l$ is understood．

12．kail va $\theta$ apia］These words are omitted in a few MSS．and some Versions and Fathers． And Griesb．and others are inclined to cancel them；but without reason；for the number of those MSS．is but five，and the omission of them may readily be accounted for from the two cal＇s． Or the framers of the text of those MSS．（altered ones）may have thought the words unnecessary and better away．Either of these reasons，and especially the latter，may have occasioned their omission in the l＇ersions also，which，indeed，are not good evidence in matters of this kind．As to the evidence of the Fathers，it is but slender when it regards the omission of words which seem not very necessary．Besides，the common read－ ing is placed beyond doubt by the recurrence of this passage verbatim infra xi．6．without any Var．lect．，except that one Version and Epiph． omit anal ta $\theta$ apia．Some MSS．，both there and here，place til $\gamma \bar{\eta} s$ not after terpároda，but either after т $\dot{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \pi е т \dot{\alpha}$, or after $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{\theta}_{\eta \rho i a . ~ T h i s, ~}^{\text {a }}$ however，arose either（as Math．supposes）＂ex pluralitate membrorum，＂or rather from a desire to clear the construction of the clause，which they perceived（though the Commentators have not）

 $\gamma \bar{y}$ s corresponds to roup oupavoū，and is not to be regarded，with worst．and Kin．，as a Hebrew pleonasm．Tetpdzoda denotes the tame beasts， בהמת，as Apia the wild ones，Tr．Wet．com－ pares Orpheus Argon．73．кク入
 typified，（ the removal of the distinction of clean and unclean meats，and the abrogation of the ceremonial law）see Recens．Synop．Even the Jewish Rabies supposed that at the coming of the Messiah the distinction would be done away．
















14．$\mu \eta \delta \alpha \mu \omega \bar{\omega}$ ］This and o vi $\delta \alpha \mu \overline{\omega s}$ ，forms of denial and repugnance，are relics of the old word $\dot{\alpha} \mu \dot{\delta}$, which in the antient language signified aliquis．In the place of this formula is some－ times used $\mu \dot{\eta}$ خévorto Absit！or the $\mu \dot{\eta}$ oi $\bar{\eta} r a$ of the Tragedians．（Valckn．）
－кotvov］This term properly signifies what belongs to all，as in Sap．vii．3．кotvòs ájo． But the Jews applied the term（like the Heb． חלל）to what was profane，i．e．not holy，and therefore of common and promiscuous use；as Ez．xiii．20．，where it is opposed to äqtov．and

 term to what was impure，whether naturally，or legally ；as in Mark vi．2．compared with 1 Macc． i． 47 and 62．Finally，it was used of meats for－ bidden，or such as had been partaken of by idola－ tens，and which，as they rendered the eaters thereof impure，were themselves called nova and aida $\theta a \rho \tau \alpha$ ，terms also applied to the eaters． （Kin．）

15．ėкaAd́pıбє］i．e．hath declared pure，or made so by removing the law which forbade its use．Thus，by the noivou is meant pronounce or account impure．It is well observed by Kin． that in the Ilebrew，Greek，and Latin，any one is said to do a thing，who declares it to be done， as in Levit．xiii．3，13，and 17，цlaiveıv and ка－ $\theta a \rho i\} \epsilon L D$ are so used．The Classical writers abound in examples．See Win．Gr．§ 31．d． All this was（as Bp ．Warburton has shown， Vol．vi．p．70．）equivalent to＂saying that the distinction between meats was abolished，and consequently that the Gentiles were to be ad－ misted into the Church of Christ．＂
16．$\dot{\pi} \pi i$ topis］There is not，as Kypke and Kin．imagine，a redundancy in the $e \pi t$ ， which signifies into，or as far as，and must always be understood in this phrase，and is generally expressed，or（at least $\epsilon$ is）in the best writers． The vision was thrice repeated，to denote greater
certainty，and to fix it more strongly on Peter： mind．On the number three see Genes．xii．wi：
 phrase Kypke adduces examples from the Cis：－ sisal writers，all of which have wore added
 rod $\gamma \in$ ¢ovós．Peter＇s doubt was not，whether this distinction of meats was abolished，but whether that implied a removal of the distinction betwets Jews and Gentiles．

19．dicuvupovévou］So almost all the Edits from Beng．and Wets．to Vat．edit．，from mas y MSS．，Versions，Fathers，and the Edit．Priac． for the common reading t̀v设设évov．I wot add，that this is confirmed by those passage at Cyrill and other Fathers cited by Boissonade ar． Steph．Thess．And indeed compounds are of te changed to simples by the scribes．Were not the authority for $\delta i \epsilon \nu$ ．considerable，（though the number of the MSS．which have it do not exceri twenty，and I see not how Versions can be any evidence）I should suspect that the $\dot{o}_{6}$ aron from the is a little before at diceporijacares and $\delta^{\prime} \eta \pi \rho_{\rho} \rho \epsilon$ ．And this is countenanced by the fact． that oz $\epsilon \theta \nu \mu \epsilon \bar{i} \sigma \theta a t$ is no where else found．Many examples might be adduced of compound vest which have no better origin than the mistakes oi scribes，though they have been unwarily intro－ duce into the new Edition of Steps．Thee
20．$d \lambda \lambda \alpha$ ］age，agedum．A particle of ex－ hortation．M Move dıaкк．．，making no scruple．＇ namely，that thou art called to visit a heathen． On д̀ıaкр．see Note on Mark xi． 23.
21．тoùs $d \pi \epsilon \sigma \tau a \lambda \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu o u s-a \dot{d} \tau \delta \nu]$ These words are omitted in very many MSS．，Versions． and Fathers，and are cancelled by almost every Editor of consequence ；and rightly，being doubt－ less from the margin．

 $\rho \in i$ is．Virgo．fin．i．593．Curam，quem queritis， ndsum．








 mai toùs àvaykaious фídous．











24．Tn emavion］i．e．on the morrow after the day he had set out ；for the journey，being one of fifteen hours distance，was too great for one day．
－toùs dуаүкaíous фí入ove］Ot גขáyкatot， like necessarii in Latin，denotes 1．relations by consanguinity ：2．those by affinity；3．persons connected by the bonds of friendship．Of each of these senses examples are adduced by kypke and Wets．When фíiol is added，the sense is determined to mean confidential and intimate friends．The most apposite passage adduced by


25．ciace入tciv）Sub．roup，as dependent upon zveca，which is expressed in several MSS．
－жробeкúnnasy This carried with it a pros－ tration of the body to the earth，and was a mark of profound respect，rendered in the Fast not only to monarchs，but also to other persons of high dignity ；though by the Romans it was ren－ dered to the Deity alone．Certainly Cornelius， who was cureßris cal no Coúnevos to v Өej̀， could not intend to offer any mark of respect in－ consistent with his duty to God．He，no doubt， regarded Peter（as having been the subject of a preternatural communication）in the light of a Divine legate，and，as such，entitled to a mark of reverence like that offered to the Deity himself． Especially as he must have been aware，that Oriental custom allowed of such a mark of pro－ found reverence being shown from man to man． Peter，on the other hand，bearing in mind the very different custom of the Romans，with unaf－ ferted religious humility declines it．
28．aंАс́діто́v］This is not well rendered un－
lawful；for that would be rapávoнov．Whereas the sense here is diбeßis or divó⿱宀八九力．See Phavor． Lex．We may render nefus est．See several ex－ apples of oi $\theta \dot{\epsilon} \mu \iota \tau \dot{\nu} \nu \dot{d} \sigma \tau$ adduced from the Classical writers in Recens．Synop．The phrase
 enter any one＇s house，is a further evolving of the sense contained in co $\lambda \bar{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha t$ ，on which see Note on v．13．＇A入入oфu ́dco．The word properly means only a foreigner；but，as Ruin．observes， it is in the Sept．，Philo，and Joseph．used（as here）in a double sense，so as to denote not only such as are distinguished from Jeurs，but from all other nations；neither Jews by birth nor by re－ ligion，and elsewhere styled そevol or di入入órpiot．
－кal \＆$\mu \mathrm{ol}$ ］The cal is for кaírot，and yet．
29．dעavrıp prices］＇without gainsaying or hesitation．＇I he word occurs only in the later writers．Aó ye，like the Hebr．Ta．often sig－ nifies thing，i．e．cause or reason；as 1 Cor．xv． 2.
 however，is not，properly speaking，Hebraic，be－ cause Raphael and Kypke have proved it to occur in Greek．So Eurip．Iph．Thur．358．Tint入óyø тор $\theta \mu$ cues；Yet I remember not a single passage where it signifies plainly thing：but，in both the above，$\lambda \delta \sigma^{\circ}$ may best be rendered ac－ count，quite agreeably to the proper sense of $\lambda$ d yo．
 nent recent Interpreters take this to mean，that Cornelius had fasted from the time of his vision to the time when Peter arrived．And this would seem to be called for by the correspondence of «жd and $\mu$ éxpt．But it involves an improbability． and adverts to a circumstance which Cornelius would not have been likely to mention．Besides，











a Deut. 10. 17 ${ }_{7}^{17}{ }_{7}{ }^{2}$ Par. 19.
7.

Job 34.12.
Sip. 6.7 Eccl. 35.16. Mom. 2.11 . Gal. 2. 6. Col. 3.25.











it is liable to other and verbal objections, which are well stated by Kin., who would take the $d \pi d$ for $\pi \rho o$, as xv. 7. 2 Cor. viii. 10. ix. 2. and $t$ in Prov. viii. 23. and elsewhere. Yet $\alpha \pi d$ can never properly be said to be put for $\pi \rho o$. When it seems to be so used, there is in ellip., for
 Thus the sense (as Beza, Grot., Peace, and Guin. have seen) is: 'Four days ago 1 was fasting up to this hour.'
31. w $\rho o \sigma e v \times$ i] At ver.4. we have moore xai : but the sense is the same, mpoocvx $\eta$ being here, as very often, put in a generic sense, for a continued custom of prayer.

 Plato Sympos. p. 170 . Worst.
34. тробшто入 $\eta^{\prime} \pi \tau \eta \varepsilon$ ] i.e. one who is partial in his attentions, and shows his favours with areference to rank, dignity, or other grounds of external superiority, to the neglect of those who are destitute of these advantages. See Lu. xx.21. and Note.
 épyá̧ecoas with סıккacooúvyv and other words expressive of actions or moral dispositions, (as also that of the Hebr. פעשה (y) involves a notion of habit. No examples are adduced by the Commentators from the Classical writers; and I can only instance one of the derivative of

 able to him,' 'approved unto him.'
 a perplexity of construction, which the Conner? tators seek in various ways to remove, either making some slight alteration, or by taking Accuse. for a Nominal. But, as I have shown:Recent. Synop., none of these modes can. adopted, and the only satisfactory one is ( $\mathrm{a}:$ : several of the older and the most eminent rect Commentators) to connect $\tau d \nu$ dor $\gamma$ on with oü̃:ा in the next verse, and place oüros-K úpus a parenthesis, thus repeating $\dot{\rho} \bar{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{x}$, as syrnymous with $\lambda o ́ y o v$, and in apposition with 1 . At $\alpha \pi \in \dot{\sigma} \sigma \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$ repeat $\dot{\delta}$ teds from the context. Aóyos here signifies the doctrine of Christ, ixiii. 26. xáy ${ }^{2} \omega v$, both Jews and Gentiles; fo? as Lord of all, he must intend the salvation of all. Kúpos suggests that high dignity of th: Redeemer which is more distinctly express. supra v. 31.
38. 'I $\eta \sigma \circ \bar{u} \nu \tau \delta \nu \alpha \pi \dot{o}$ N.] This is suspends: on the oldare preceding; and in oldare Inaner cis ex $\rho \iota \sigma e \nu$ ait Td there is a common Greek idiot: So that there is, in reality, no transposition, aKin. imagines. "Expırev, by a metaphor taken from the mode of inaugurating Kings, sir? nifies in rested, and indued, namely at his baptism. See iv. 27. and Lu. iv. 18. And in тvérpaт: ayr ic cal ouvápet there is a Hendiadys. The sense is, "with the powerful influence of the Holy Spirit.". See Bp. Middl. The genera sense couched in evepyerienv is exemplified in the words following cal línevor- $\Delta \iota \beta \beta$ nov, when the кataduv, ind rove Alaßóגov seems to be a


















more explicit mode of speaking for $\delta a, \mu o v i y_{0}-$ mévous. let it may be meant to include persons sick of very dangerous and incurable disorders, such being by the Jews also ascribed to demonjacal influence. This, however, was a type of the spiritual healing, and the deliverance from the tyranny of sin in our members which Christ came to accomplish.
39. cal] 'even.' This is found in many of the best XISS., in several Versions and Fa there, and in the Ed. Prince., and is rightly admitted by Beng., Wets., Match., Griesb., Knapp., Titty., and Vat.; since it is strongly supported by internal as well as external evidance.
41. Iрокехесрот.] This is not, as Ruin. Amapines, for the simple кexetp., since as the Xe. imports appointment, so the z po imports precious distinction. Metal td duaनtīvat aunty d. v. some Editors and Commentators would join with v. 40, the intermediate passage oi navrl-ouverooney aura being placed in a parenthesis. This they are induced to do because, say they, we do not find that Jesus drank, however he might eat with his disciples after his resurrection. But though that be not recorded there can be little doubt but that he did. See Chrysost. in loc. To take the expressions eating and drinking ruth, as Guin. does, as a phrase denoting familiar intercourse, is alike objectionable in principle, and unnecessary.
43. тdvтes of To.] The best Commentators are agreed that raves may here (as often) be taken in a restricted sense, (populariter) to sigunify very many.
44. Td queupa rod afar] i.e. the influence of the Holy Spirit, which has been before spoken of, (see Middle.) implying its extraordinary gifts,
and especially, as we learn from v. 46, the speaking in languages foreign and before unknown to them. See supra, ii. 4. and Notes, from a comparison of which passage with the present it is plain that by $\gamma \lambda \omega^{\prime} \sigma \sigma a t s$ is here meant drépats $\gamma \lambda \omega^{\prime} \sigma \sigma a s$, as there, and (as is plain from the
 $\phi \theta$ éryeotas, as is there expressed. To have heard them speak the praises of God and Christ in their own language (Greek or Latin) would have conveyed no proof that they had received the gift of the Holy Spirit. Besides, compare V. 47. with xi. 16. The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$, too, at v. 46. has reference to a clause omitted, q.d. ' [And that it had been poured forth on these persons was certain] for' \&ce. I should not have thought it necessary to point out what is so plain, had not the sense been egregiously misconceived by Noesselt, Heine., and Kin.
 $\lambda \dot{v} c o$ takes (as here and in Lu. vi. 20, and sometimes in the Classical writers) the Accus., the verb may be supposed to have a significatio pragnans, including that of another verb, namely, of taking or using. The той $\mu \dot{\eta} \beta a \pi T$. is for er $\sigma$ 们 $\beta a \pi \tau$. In this idiom the $\mu \eta$ is said to be pleonastic ; and this, the grammarians tell us, extends to all verbs which contain a denial, especially verbs of hindering. See Matth. Gr. Gr. $\oint 533$. Obs. 3. Thus the $\mu \eta$ is sometimes omitted. But, in fact, there is no pleonasm, since the $\mu \dot{\eta}$ belongs to another sentence, in which occasionally the verb in the preceding is to be repeated with some modification. As to the omission of the $\mu \dot{r}$, that takes place chiefly when the verb of hindering is followed by another in the Infinitive without a $\boldsymbol{\text { o }}$; in which case the Infin. plainly forms part of the preceding
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sentence, and therefore cannot well take a $\mu \dot{\eta}$, though instances are found where it is used.
 they were baptized; but there can be little doubt that (as the antient and early modern Commentators supposed) the persons who baptized them were some of those whom Peter brought with him from Joppa. Whether they were (as Lightf. and Scott think) pastors, may, considering the then unformed state of the Church, be doubted.
 lated with him, litigating the question,
3. גккроß. éxovтas] Synonymous with év ciкроBuनTia $\delta_{\nu \tau a s,}$ which is of frequent occurrence, those who are uncircumcised.'
5. $\left.\tau \in \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma \rho \sigma \iota \nu \alpha^{\prime} \rho \chi a i s\right]$ The true sense of this expression has been fully explained supra $x .11$. It may suffice here to observe, that the sense in the present passage cannot be made complete without supplying $\delta \in \delta \in \mu \in \dot{v} \eta \nu$, which is expressed in the parallel passages, and here by the Syriac Translators.
17. el] 'siquidem,' 'if [as was the case].'
















－edam de cis ग̈ulv，ouvaros］The ot is omitted in many MNS．，and Versions；but．I suspect，from the difficulty of explaining it．let it may very well be rendered denique，then． There is great spirit in this turn of expression， with which Wets．compares from Lucian，rosita
 mentators pass by unnoticed the difficulty in construction as regards duvards，which is，by a harsh ellipse．put for core duvatos civet．Thus the Syr．well renders gui sufticerem ad ar．

18．मirixacay ］＇they acquiesced in silence．＇ Els $\zeta$ coil，${ }^{\circ}$ in order that they may attain sal－ ration．＇

19．of $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ oüv iago．］The particle $\mu \dot{\lambda} \nu$ oui is resumptive，reverting to what was said supra viii．1．＇A $A$ d is here for $\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \boldsymbol{d}$ ，as often both in the Scriptural and Classical writers．＇Ext Etc－ paves．Commentators differ in their explanation of the force of $\dot{e} \pi$ ．some rendering it sub，others post．The latter sense is supported by the most eminent persons；yet the other may be the true one．

20．＇F $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu$ iotas $]$ ．There is much difference of opinion as to the interpretation，nay even the reading．If we adopt the usual signification of ＇EA入ŋиıoral，namely，foreign Jews using the Greek lungnaze，then it will follow that these Cyprians and Cyrenarans did no more than what those Jerusalemite Christians，who had been dis－ persed after the death of Stephen，had done． To remove this difficulty some would assign the sense＇Gentiles；＇others，＇proselytes of the gate．＇ But it is objected，that such proselytes were always reckoned as Jets；and that，as to the former interpretation，no proof has been adduced of the sense thus ascribed．Hence Beza，Grot．， Lo Clerc，Beng．，Drus．，Doddr．，Rosenm．， Heine．，Wahl，and Guin．would rear l＂B入入пעas， from some Miss．，Versions，and Fathers，which is edited by Griesb．．Knapp，and Tittm．；but，I conceive，on insufficient grounds．The authority for this reading consists of tue o only of the moet altered MSS．，five or six Versions，and three or
four citations from the Fathers．And the recent researches of the diligent Rick have not added a particle more to this authority，which is mani－ featly very insufficient ；for the evidence of Yer－ sons is very slender，since the antient Translators often render carelessly，confounding＂E $\lambda \lambda \eta \boldsymbol{q} \in s$ and＇Eג times as if the former were read，（see vi．1．\＆ ix．（2））and therefore why should they not have done so here！And as to the Fathers，they cite with too little attention to accuracy to have much weight in a matter of this kind．Indeed，Math． has shown that those here adduced sometimes cite as if they read Endnutoras．It is plain， then，that the common reading must be retained， and either taken，with some，in the sense Cen－ tiles（i．e．as if E E $\lambda \bar{\eta}$ vas were here written just as in Joh．vii．35．\＆xii．20．＇BA入ñّes is used for ＇Eג入ๆvigrai），which Schleus．shows may be tolerated；or in the usual sense to denote foreign Hers using the Greek language．See Pearce and Camps．Math．remarks：＂Non ergo h． 1. Judxi et Gentiles，cen Judas Hetraice et Grace loquentes opponuntur．＂And if，even after all， the sense be thought doubtful，the best mode of settling it is to preserve the fountain of truth pure，by retaining the reading of almost all the MSS．
21．yelp］i．e．help，perhaps evinced super－ naturally，as Chris．and Newt．think．
 accounted an Oriental redundancy．But it is better to consider it as a stronger expression than $\boldsymbol{y} \times o \dot{c} \sigma \theta_{\eta}$ by itself，and formed by a blending of two expressions，i．e．＂to come to the ears of＂ and＂to be heard by．＂

23．Tiv Xajov т．日．］＇the favour and kind－ ness of God，viz．in its effects，the admission of the Gentiles to the benefits of the Gospel．
 noun in regimen has here，as often，the force of an adjective；and the sense must be，＇with hearty and determined purpose and intention．＂ This is，however，not（as it is usually esteemed）









purely a Hebrew idiom, being occasionally found in the Classical writers. So Herodian cited by
 Moo $\mu \in ́ v \in \iota \nu$ signifies properly to remain by, and with a Dat. of thing, signifies to persevere in, but with that of person, to continue attached to.
 think this assigns a reason why the Christians at Jerusalem chose Barnabas for the mission to
 pit w being considered as parenthetical. And the sense of divio ajax is may be assimilated to an idiom of our own language, by which the expression a good man includes the notions of virtue or integrity, and benignity or gentleness. But the passage in question is certainly not parenthetical, and the common interpretation, which refers the words to what immediately areceded, is best founded. Nor need the sense of öт be pressed upon. The next words каi $\pi \lambda$ rips - niorews must not be explained away, (with many recent Interpreters) but have their full force.

- cal тробетé $\theta \eta-n$ vi ice] These words are connected with the preceding, and the sal should be rendered hence, or literally 'and [thus].'

26. $\sigma u \nu \alpha \chi^{\theta} \bar{\eta} \nu \alpha, ~ \dot{\epsilon \nu} \tau \hat{n} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \kappa \lambda$.] '..assembled together with the church. See xiii. 44. xiv. 27.
 каi $\epsilon \mu о \bar{u}$ т $v \in \dot{\prime} \mu a \tau o s$. This use of the passive and neuter sense is frequent in this and many other verbs.
 signifies, 1. to despatch business; 2. to so despatch it as to obtain a name. Hence, 3. it came to mean 'to be named or called.' Of this sense, which occurs also in Rom. vii. 3., several exampres from Philo and Joseph. are adduced by the Commentators. It must, however, be allowed to involve a harsh catachresis. And this would be rather increased, were we, with Benson, Doddr., Bingham, and Towns., to render 'were named by Divine appointment;' and increased unnecessarily; for why should it not be thought as likely that the followers of Christ should have received a distinctive name, which they now needed, from men as well as from God? Why call in Divine interposition so needlessly? Besides, the occurrence of $\pi \rho \bar{\omega} \tau 0 \nu$ seems to exclude that view and demands the other. It is not so easy to settle another question connected with these words, namely, whether the followers of Christ gave this appellation to themselves, or whether it was bestowed on them by others. The best Commentators are of the latter opinion, and Wets. and Kuin. (ap. Recens. Synop.) ad-
duce many arguments why the former view cannot be admitted; not all of them equally coset. but, upon the whole, sufficient to establish the position. It was indeed the interest of the Chars plans to have some name which might not, as the Jewish ones, Nazarene or Galileans, imply reproach. And the terms believers or saints, thoust they might suffice among themselves, were Dc: sufficiently definite to form appellations. And the: might therefore be not disinclined to adopt ace Yet the necessity was not so great as to stimulate them to do this very soon: whereas the people at large, in having to speak of this new siwould need some distinctive appellation, and what: so distinctive as one formed from the same of c; founder. Thus we find from Philostr. Tit. Ap. viii. 21., that the disciples of Apollonius wert called by the Greeks (it is not said by theeselves) 'A Gentiles should resort to such a sort of appelizton, since in that age those who were followerof any sect, or partizans of any leader, were usually called after their teacher or leader, by a term ending in-cos or anus. There is, however no reason to think, with Wets. and Kuin., thy the name Xptotiavol was given in deristex. When it is used by Agrippa (Acts xxvi. 28. there is no proof that it was a term of reproach. Had Agrippa intended derision, he might have employed the term Nazarene, which was still, no doubt, in much use among the Jews. Thus the followers of Christ would be the more likely to adopt the former, (as they would soon see fit to do) both for convenience, and to keep out a term of reproach. In 1 Pet. iv. 16. el de as Xpic.
 xciv.) the appellation occurs as one applied by the followers of Christ to themselves as well as given by others.
27. троф $\bar{\tau} \tau a t$ The term seems to denote persons who, with more or less of the gifts of the Holy Spirit, applied themselves to teaching or preaching, and occasionally, under a more than usual influence of the Holy Spirit, foretold future events. This sense of the word is supposed to he confined to the Scriptures; but I have met with it in the Classical writers, e. gr. Herodian, v. 5 ,

 where the Editor refers to Sext. Emp. p. 227. Lucian i. 391. Did. Sic. 199. Herodot. $555-49$. Hemsterh. ad Aristoph. Plut. 357.
28. érijave] he declared, or announced. The term, however, was often applied to the uttering of predictions \&c. "O $\lambda_{\eta \nu}$ Tiv oik. Bp. Pearce has adduced many solid reasons for sup-




 $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \nu \tau \notin \rho o u s$ dıà $\chi є \iota \rho o ̀ s ~ B a \rho \nu a ́ ß a ~ к а i ~ \Sigma a u ́ \lambda o u . ~$








posing that this expression denotes not the whole world, not even the Roman Empire, but Palestine alone. The same view is ably supported by Walsh, Doddr., Krebs, Nichaelis, and Kin., who adduce statements of the four famines which history has recorded as happening in the reign of Claudius. As, however, all the countries put together would not make up a tenth even of the Roman Empire, they think it plain that we must take the words of that famine which, (as we learn from Josephus) in the fourth year of Claudius, overspread Palestine; and for the relief of the Christians suffering under which, the money was collected at Antioch.
29. кaticis ทivepecitó ais] 'in proportion to the ability of each.' Sub. xpypatmon, which is sometimes expressed. Eixtop. is a comparative term, and does not necessarily imply wealth. So Mason. cited by Kypke: $\dot{\lambda} \lambda^{\prime}$ ©üx pot x $\rho \eta$ matter tines od n al mioúato. In fact, compotency is the sense had in view, which is confirmed by Ammonius ap Wets. "Opioav,' determinal.' The word signifies 1. terminate: 2. determinate; 3. decernere. Els bıaкoviav. Literally, 'for a service,' 'for the relief of.' So Hebr. vi. 10. ס九anovioavres lois amos. This relief was the more necessary, since, independently of the present famine, the Christians at Jerusalem were generally poor. In sending this bounty they did but imitate the example of the foreign Jews, who (as Vitringa has proved) used to send contributions for the relief of their poor brethren at Jerusalem.
 able annotation on the origin and various uses of mper阝úrepos, showing that in the Christian Church of the Apostolic age, (which was formed almost wholly on the model of the Synagogue) the term требßúrepot (a term implying rather the wisdom of age, than age itself) was synonymous with dतifкотol. Their common office and duty, in the words of Forbiger ap. Schleus. Lex., was in general to govern the Christian Church, not to teach; to preside over things sacred, to administer the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, to decide on Ecclesiastical matters, to compose and settle differences, and finally to
set an example to all of rectitude of doctrine and sanctity of life. See xx. 17 \& 28.1 hel. i. 1. 1 Tim. iii. 1. Titi. 5 \& 7. and consult an elaborate Note of Mr. Towns. on this subject, Vol. ii. p. $151.8 q$.
 took in hand, commenced, set about. The Classical writers use the expression, but without Xeipa or Xeipas; though they more frequently use $\dot{\text { Exixetpeiv. It seems therefore to be Hel- }}$ lenistic Greek, which is confirmed by its occur-

 translations are needlessly literal.

- какө̄̈aai] to maltreat or oppress.

3. มробє' $\theta \epsilon \tau о \quad \sigma v \lambda \lambda$.$] 'proceeded to apple-$
 where see Note. This idiom occurs in the I. XX. and is called a IIebraism, being so used with an Infinitive following.
 paschal feast, during which they were ordered to have unleavened bread in their houses.' See Deut. xvi. 6. Exod. xii. 18. Before $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu$ ćpas several MSS. some of them ancient prefix the Article, which is admitted by Matth., Griesb., Knapp, and Titty. But lip. Niddl. justifies the omission on the principle, that " in propositions which merely affirm or deny existence, the name of the person or thing whereof existence is affirmed or denied, is without the Article. So Matt. xiv. 6. $\gamma \in v e$ -
 principle, however, is, I apprehend, too refined and far-fetched. It is better in such a case to say, that the Article is omitted because onecessary, the addition of the noun in the Genit. sufficing to establish the definiteness. Here there is also an ellipsis, the complete phraseo-
 This probably led to the ai being at first marked in the margin, which afterwards crept into the text.
4. тетрadiots] The tetpadion was, as we learn from Polyb., the regular number for a guard, (as a file is with us) each four of the sixteen standing guard in turn, two of them, as we find, in the prison, and two at the door.






















5. éктevis] intense, fervent. So Lu. xxii. 4.
 is taken from a rope at full tension) is found in the LXX. Judith iv. 7. 2 Macc. xiv. 38. Jon. iii. 8. Joel i. 14.
6. $\mu e \tau a \xi i-\delta \cup \sigma l]$ Prisoners thus carefully guarded were usually among the Romans secured with one chain, one end of which was attached to the right hand of the prisoner, and the other to the left hand of the person who guarded him. In the present instance, for better security, there were $t u w$ chains, each fastened to a soldier.
 school in Germany deny the reality of this angelic appearance, and seek to account for Peter's release from natural causes. But Mr. Towns. has shown that in their eagerness to do away angelic and miraculous interference, they suppose circumstances which involve even a greater
 quant euphemism or íxoкopiб $\mu$ ós. See my Note on Thucyd. iv. 82. No. 17. (Transl.) On the situation of this prison there has been no little discussion. Wolf thinks it was in the city, and near to the judgment hall. De Dieu and Fessed imagine it was in the Court of Herod's palace, and was his private prison. Walch supposes the prison to have been in one of the towers of the innermost of the three walls which surrounded the city. The last is, I agree with Kin., the most probable opinion. See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 4.
 rousing persons from sleep.

7. $\pi \rho \omega^{\prime} \tau \eta \nu-\sigma i \partial ̀ \eta \rho \bar{\alpha} \nu$ ] The first was tb e station of the second quaternion, the second watch of the third, and the iron-gate of tho fourth. Фépougav. The term is properly neal of a road, but sometimes, as here, of a door leading to any place. Aüтoнd́тn, literally, self. moved. The word is used both of persons and things, and must be rendered accordingly. Priv. and Wets. adduce several examples of the word in this sense, and as used of doors. The circumstance of a gate self-moving was regarded by the antients as a prodigy preeminently attesting the presence of the Deity. See the examples in Recent. Synop.
8. $\gamma \in \nu o \mu e \nu o s$ द̀v éautø] ] When, recovering from his surprise, he tranquilly exercised his understanding.' (Scott.) Of this phrase example are adduced by Wets. and Kypke.

- тáбฑs $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \delta o \kappa$.] The best Interpraters are agreed that xpoodok. must be taken, by metonymy, for the thing expected, i.e. his expected execution, as in Genes. xix. 10. Enos
 sense is, 'from what was fully expected by' \&ce. The Syr. renders 'ab omni machinations.' i suspect that he read xpodoxias, 'lying in wait, a word not found in the Lexicons, though maolox ${ }^{[60}$ occurs in Thucyd. and other writers. nov is added to 'Iovo. because at the time of the Passover the whole nation, in manner. was assembled.
 situation and the circumstances connected with it.
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13．крои́лаитos－Trì 0 úpay］This phrase oc－ curs also in Lu．xiii． 25 ．and often in the later writers；the earlier ones use кóxten．The two words differ in sense as our rap and knock．Try Bipay $\tau$ ．mu入ños，the porch－door，or outer－ gate，as opposed to the inner door，which led immediately to the inner court around which the apartment was built．Пatoíanๆ．Many Com－ mentators understand by this the portress．But though that office was often performed by females， it is improbable，considering the narrow circum－ stances of the Christians at Jerusalem，that there should have been one at this house．Besides， that would require the Article．Though even had the Article been used，the sense might have been＇the maid－servant，＇supposing there were but one．Here it can only mean＇a damsel，＇or rather a maidservant．＇lँжaкō̈gat．The word signifies properly to listen，but when used of the ottice of a Porter，which it often is in the best writers，carries with it，by implication，other significations corresponding to the actions con－ netted therewith，as answering to the angel＇s inquiring the name sic．，which are one or other sometimes expressed in versions，though not cor－ rectly．Occasionally it means no more than to mind，or attend to the door．At all events，no extraordinary caution（such as Bp ．Peace fancies） is implied．so in a kindred passage of Lucian

 нодедos．

15．rainy］A popular form of expression used of any one who utters what is absurd，or quite incredible．$\Delta_{i i \sigma}$ vopiそero，＇positively as－ sited：
－$\dot{\dot{j}}$ àrfolos aíroù ed．］Many eminent In－ terpreters，take this to mean＇a messenger sent from him．＇But the word will not admit that sense；neither is it likely that Peter could have sent a messenger，still less that the maid should not have known＇Peter＇s voice．The sense must be，＇his angel．＇i．e．his tutelary angel，such as the Jews，and indeed the Gentiles，thought was appointed to every person，at least every good person．This angel，they also supposed，（as has been the prevalent notion of every age），on the death of the person，sometimes appeared in his exact form，and speaking with his voice，to the friends or acquaintance of the deceased．
I must not omit to mention that Bp．Middl．，
taking exception to the employment of the Ar － title here，（see Note on Joh．viii．44．）and yet finding no sufficient authority for its being can－ celled proposes to take the aúroū as an adverb， and taking the Article for the pronoun possessive， would render，＇His angel is there ；＇which rem－ dens transposition necessary．But for this trans－ position there is no authority except that of one ils．，and therefore in that it may very well be supposed to have been accidental，arising from the scribe＇s inadvertently omitting aüroü and then supplying it not in its place．If，however， we were to adopt that position of the words，and to take the aúzoü as an adverb，yet，I apprehend， the Article could not stand for the pronoun pos－ sessive ；since that idiom has its limits，and cannot be used where any very great uncertainty would arise．As to the auvoú being，as he thinks，un－ derstosed，according to his Canon iii． $1 \& 4$ ．，that is the weakest part of Bp ．Middleton＇s system． See Note supra v．1．The learned Prelate，in－ deed，seems to have himself suspected his posi－ ton to be untenable，by proposing to read $\dot{j} \boldsymbol{d} \gamma$－
 us suppose is not a Critical conjecture，because it is compounded of turn readings．But as there is next to no authority for the aúroù after darin， it can be viewed in no other light．Besides，the principle on which he proceeds is unsound in Criticism．What is more，the second aùoü would be pleonastic and useless－quite unsuit－ able to the brevity of such exclamations，and， in short，＂mire Sithiniu frisidius．＂＇In fact， the learned Commentator would have been quick－sighted enough in seeing all this，and how unlikely it was that such a nicety of idiom． supposing it to exist，should have been observed in the Hellenistic and popular phraseology，had it not been for his Canon，which（as occasionally elsewhere）was a mote in his eye．

16．eidov aivivy i．e．＇they saw it was he．＇
 signifies to rave the hand dountrards；a mode of enjoining silence；as xiii．16．xix．33．xxi． 40 ． It occurs also in the best writers，from whom examples are adduced by the Commentators． The most apposite is from Heliod．iv．16．кaтa－ reface Tị xetpi．Herodian i．9，8．Ta j Miss xetpos
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 are left to comjecture；the expression being quite indefinite．Some suppose Casarea；others，with more probability，Antioch；others，again，and chiefly the Roman Catholic interpreters，Rome； which last opinion，though long strenuously con－ tended against by Presbyterian writers，has lately been ably and perhaps successfully estab－ lished by Townsend，Vol．ii．p．140．seqq．in a Dissertation on St．Peter＇s visit to Rome and the writing of St．Mark＇s Gospel．
 made for him．＇＇Avaкpivas roùs фú入aкаs \＆c．， ＇after examining the keepers［and finding they offer nothing in justification］，ordered them to be led away for execution．＇＇A Ad́yetv is a vox sol．de hac re，eis $\theta \dot{\alpha} \nu a \tau o \nu$ or $̇ \pi i l \theta a \nu \alpha ́ \tau \varphi$ being generally expressed，but sometimes left to be understood，for death is in this formula always implied．So Esth．xii．3．kal juo入ogivantes （having confessed their crime）anjx $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\eta \sigma a \nu . ~ I ~}^{\text {a }}$ should not have deemed it necessary to say so much on this head，but that Bp．Pearce has raised a doubt as to the reading；and others have maintained that the punishment was not unto death．
－$\delta t e ́ t \rho\llcorner\beta \in \nu]$ scil．èкєi，which is implied in the preceding，as at xiv．3．The word is gene－ rally erpressed，as in Joh．iii． 22. xi．64．Acts xiv．28．xxv． 14.
 fies＇to have war at heart with，＇to be hostilely disposed towards，and sometimes to be at uar with；which last signification is here adopted by some Commentators．But that involves much improbability of various kinds，and is so desti－ tute of Historical support，that it is better to interpret the expression मi iरoüvтo eiprivض̀，on which the foregoing view is founded，in a meta－ phorical sense，i．e．they sought to be friends with，as elppìmp éxougt at Acts vii．26．，and to take $\theta u \mu o$ ．in the first mentioned and general sense．Kuin．，with great probability，traces the origin of this misunderstanding to commercial jealousies，arising from Herod＇s having formed so admirable a port at Cæsarea．＇O $о о \theta \nu \mu a \delta d \nu$ ， conjointly，i．e．both Tyrians and Sidonians． IIeloavtes B入a；тov．The full sense is＇having prevailed on B1．［to give them his aid in the business］．See Matt．xxviii．14．Gal．i． 10 ．

21．тaкт $\hat{i}]$＇appointed，＇as the day of public audience．It appears from Joseph．Ant．xix． 7，2．to have been the second day of the Games then celebrating in honour of Cæesar．Brimatos． Not tribunal，as in Matt．xxvii．19．，but a raised suggestus presenting the appearance of a throne． in the theatre，where Herod viewed the game： and delivered the Oration．Mpos aitois．Not the people，as some imagine；but the ambas－ sadors，which is required by what precedes，and inu $\quad$ yopeiv often in the later writers signibe simply to deliver a speech．
22．$\delta \delta \bar{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$ ］Chiefly，if not exclusively，the Gentiles，（multitudes of whom inhabited Ca－ sarea）and set on by the courtiers and flatterer as we find from Josephus；from whom we alsin learn that the persons in question did really profess to regard him as a God；no doubt it that qualified sense in which the Roman Eni． perours were called Divi not only after the： death，but even in their lifetime，and in whic ${ }^{-1}$ the Gireeks sometimes applied the term to grez personages，（see Pind．Olymp．v．sub．int Aristid．iii． 249 \＆250．Eunap．Proer．P． 120 a 163．Appian i．635．Joseph．p．533．ult．）but y in no such as Jeus could join in；and it clearl appears from Joseph．that the Jews were it censed with him for receiving this impiou adulation．

23．і̇ $\pi \dot{\alpha} \tau a \xi \in]$ i．e．＂struck him with diseave．
 any rate mean that the disorder was infticted t God，and not brought on by dysentery arisis from cold caught，as many recent Commentato （and even Kuin．）pretend，whose argument－ have fully refuted in Recens．Synop．The ri
 prove that the disorder was of human oriz： because the Deity is pleased to act by secol causes．Here we have nothing to do wi Jewish opinions，or with Joseph．；though the is，in reality，no variation between him al St．Luke．The historian narrates the secondit causes of Herod＇s death ；the sacred writer co siders the primary one，even the immediate terposition of Heaven．And this will hold gor whether we take the dyyedos literally，or mel phorically；though it seems safer to take it does Doddr．）of the real，yet invisible，agenc， a celestial apirit．See 2 Nam．xxiv．16． 2 K it
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xix．35．It is plain by the words oud d delves tr $\rho s{ }^{\alpha} \gamma^{\alpha} \theta o u ̈$ and others，that Joseph．himself （notwithstanding that he was favourably inclined to Herod，and speaks respectfully of his memory） regarded his death as the effect of supernatural interposition；as there can be little doubt was the case with Antiochus Epiphanes，who，having endeavoured to abolish the worship of God，died of the same disorder．See 2 Macc．ix． 5 ．It is remarkable that many tyrants and other vile characters have died of a very similar disorder， the morbus pedicularis，which many Commenta－ tors suppose was Herod＇s disorder．See the nu－ merous examples of Wets．in Recens．Synop． and others there adduced．
 seed，the produce of which is sown again the next year，and so on from year to year． （scott．）
XIII．1．סıddgкa入ot］i．e．publicly appointed teachers in the Church，mentioned also in 1 Cor． xii．28．and Eph．iv． $11 .$, where see Notes．
－＇Hpaiovou That this is Herod Antipas，and not（as Grot．supposes）Agrippa the second，son of King Agrippa the first，whose death was re－ corded at xii． 23 ．，has been proved by Watch in a Dissertation de Menachemo，of which the substance is detailed by Kin．，and may be seen translated in llecens．Synop．See also Towns． Vol．ii．p． 256.
－бúntpoфos］This is properly an adjective， signifying brought up with，（and in this sense only does it occur in the earlier writers）but it is also used as a substantive equivalent to our faster－brother and is explained $\dot{\dot{\rho}} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{a}^{\lambda} \lambda a n$ avos in the Glossaries．The sense foster－hrother some－ times implied also that of table－fellow and school－ fellow．Examples of the word are adduced by Wets．from Plot．and Polyp．It was not un－ usual in antient times for children to be brought up with the children of kings and great men； and the custom has survived even to modern times，as in the case of our James the first．
2．גeitovpyoúrrwy т．к．］Aeitoupyía denotes the discharge of nome public office，whether
civil，or religious．In the Classical writers it is almost always used in the former sense；but in the sacred writers in the latter．In the O．T．， and sometimes in the New，（as Heb．x．11．）it denotes the ministration of the Priests and Le－ vitus．Here，however，$\lambda$ citovpyeiv might denote the discharge of all the duties of the ministerial office，both public and private，praying，preach－ ing，teaching，exhorting，\＆c．，but it only denotes the public duties．K ai थnorevóntoven is meant to signify that while they were thus engaged they were fasting，perhaps on an occasion of more than usual solemnity，when fasting had been added to prayer \＆c．，probably to ask a blessing on the means taken to spread the Gospel．The direction from the Holy Spirit was，it seems， communicated to them while thus engaged．On the manner in which Paul and Barnabas were called to the Apostolate，see Towns．T．ii．p． 256. and Scott in hoc．
－cire td Пиеїда тò äyıov］Here and at
 the Personality and Deity of the Holy Spirit is evidently implied．＇Афорíate br＇$\mu \circ \mathrm{ot}$ ，Афо－ pisces signifies 1 ．to separate ；2．by implication， to destine ；3．to appoint，as here．The $\delta \boldsymbol{j} j$ is hortative，and may be rendered now．The mot seems to have the imperative force，highly suit－ able to the Divine dignity of the speaker．Of this idiom，which is little known even to Critics， the following are examples．Ps．xviii．19．dyoi－
 dvorүетш èдоl．Eurip．Iph．Aul．1340．סıaxa－
 Lucian i． 718 \＆645．The $\pi \rho \circ \sigma$ in $\pi \rho o \sigma x e^{-}$ клท⿰at is not pleonastic，but signifies unto，as

 seems to be put first，because this solemnity（no doubt，gone through on some time after that on which the order of the Spirit was received）was ushered in indicto jejunum．So v．2．入ectoop－

 luke ii． 37 ．









M Matt. 13. 38.


5. ix $\eta \rho \dot{\text { ér }} \boldsymbol{\eta} \eta \mathrm{\nu}$ ] attendant, or assistant.
6. رázov] See Note supra viii. 9. Wevòo$\pi \rho o \phi$ иiт $\eta \nu$. Pearce thinks it means false teacher. But the full sense must be one who falsely claims to speak under Divine inspiration, whether in foretelling future events, or in making known the will of God. Before $\nu \bar{\eta} s o \nu \ddot{\Delta} \backslash \eta \nu$ is added by Giriesb. Tittm., and Vater from several MSS., $\backslash$ ersions, and Fathers. But the evidence of the two last is here not material, and the word seems to have come from the margin.
7. oive] 'staying with, visiting, or attending
 to be applied, by an error of title, for $\dot{a}$ vica $\sigma \rho \alpha$ тire. But l.ardner and Kuin. have vindicated the accuracy of the expression, proving by reference to Dio Cass. and other writers, that those who presided over the provinces by the appointment of the Senate, (and Cyprus was then of that number, though it had once been Proetorian) were styled Proconsuls, though they never filled the chair. इuveté, 'a man of ability.' Galen, cited by Wets., speaks of him as a person excellently versed in philosophy ; which will confirm the sense of $\mu$ ' $\gamma o s$ above assigned. Sergius had, no doubt, been learning something of Philosophy, and natural religion, if not the Jewish religion, from Elymas. Hence it was likely that he should send for thoee who taught a religion professing to be an improvement on the Jewish; and as likely that this should be opposed by Elymas, who was influenced only by worldly views.
8. 'Eגúцаг] From an Arabic word signifying doctus or sapiens. So our wiz-ard from wise. $\Delta u \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \notin a t$. At this some Commentators stumble, and Valckn. and Griesb. conjecture dinoबтpéqat. But that is wholly destitute of authority, Versions having no weight. And if even it did occur in a few MSS., it must be rejected as a gloss. The common reading is confirmed by a similar construction in Exad. v. 4. ivari
 reason for the apparent anomaly in syntax is, that there is a significatio prægnans, namely, to pervert and turn, i. e. to turn from the faith by a perversion and misrepresentation of it. So he is represented at v. 10 . as dıaбт $\rho$ é申шע тàs ìoùs kupiov.
9. $\dot{\delta}$ кal Haû̀os] Sub. кa入oúmevos; for the Article is put for the Pron. relative, on which see Win. Gr. p. 57. fin. With respect to the name IIaüdos, it is well observed by Wets. that
though St. Luke has before invariably called him Saul, now, no sooner has he mentioned taf name of Paul, than Saul becomes so obliteratet: that we no where find it used again either hy St. Luke, St. Peter, or St. Paul, in his Episti-: For this the Commentators are not a little pet: plexed to account. Some suppose that he this always had both names. But then why shou St. Luke have hitherto invariably used Saul, ar: now as invariably Paul. Others are of opini: that Saul changed his name after his conversio? But that is refuted by his being called Saul t, St. Luke after that time, and up to the preser Saul must have himself changed his name ; no however, as some imagine, out of humility adeference to the Proconsul; but, it should setr as Beza, Grot., Doddr., and Kuin. suppobecause he was now brought very much amo: Greeks and Romans, to whom the name Sa was unknown, but Paul familiar, especially they would pronounce it Paul. It may be add. that the name Paul being a Roman one, wo. be so much the more suitable to a Roman citi zen. And as the reason for the alteration, " taking the solemn charge he had now receive would be stronger than ever, there can be doubt that it was now made. It should seem St. Luke's expression, that he only assumed i name, yet did not absolutely abandon the oth. Though as he was now the Apostle of the Gify tiles, there was a propriety in St. 'Luke's hen $\cdot$ forward giving him that name which he bo among Gentiles.
9. $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \theta \in i s \pi y . \alpha \gamma$ ] ' filled with the il fluence and inspiration of the Holy Spirit, $n$ under the impression of spleen or anger. 'A $T_{T}$ viasas els a., namely, in order to make the greay impression. Comp. iii. 1. xiv. 9. xxxiii. 1.
10. ósoov] deceit and imposture. Peqdeov" rias. The word is said by Kuin. to dent 1. facility of action; 2 . levity and carelessn. whether any action be good or evil; 3. villat and wickedness. Thus it came to be synorn mous with ravoupyia, of which the ratio sic: ficationis is the same. I would compare :


 gered. Upon the whole, the word (which ocrit chiefly in the later writers) corresponds to a is indeed the same with our ruguery, (antien ragerie, as in Chaucer) and, I suspect. \& originally applied to sleight of hand tric






of mountebanks and conjurers. Me dıaßo入ov, i. e. exactly like him. See Joh. viii. 44. and Note.
 has been employed to little purpose on this word, especially from pressing too much on the metaphor. It is also debated whether rous $\mathbf{\delta \delta o u s}$ т. к. means the Lond's religion, or the vays and purposes of the Lord. As the examples adduced of the former signification have only the singular, the latter is preferable, especially as it yields nearly the same sense. The words may be thus rendered: ' misrepresenting the upright counsels and purposes of the Lord [for the salvation of men].' In this figurative diction there is, I concelve, an allusion to Is. xI. 4. " the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough ways plain," according to the LXX. (in the three principal MSS.) and the N. T. if тpaxeîa cis ódovs deías. And so v. 3.
11. L8oì] As we say, Mind! take notice! Xelp тoй кupiou exi $\sigma$. A Hebrew phrase denoting that Divine punishment is suspended over a person. See Exod. ix. 3. Job xix. 21. The rout before kupiov is omitted in very many MSS., Fathers, and early Edd.; and perhaps it has no place, though Bp. Middl. is of opinion that, if retained, it would not follow that xelp would
 This is thought to be a Hebrew mode of asserting the same thing both by affirmation and by negation of the contrary. But the idiom occurs also in the Greek and Latin writers, and is only a relic of primitive simplicity of diction. It does not involve pleonasm, but the latter phrase serves to explain and strengthen the former; as in a kin-


 pression than ruфids (for all but persons born blind have some faint view of the sun) that there is a sort of climax, and we might render freely, 'thou shalt be blind, yea stone blind!'

- ¿xps aacpoū] The Latin Versions render it 'usque ad tempus.' And so the Syriac and some Oriental onee. But that would require méxpı, as is proved by Tittm. de Syano. p. 37., who righty oberves: ${ }^{2} \times \rho$ non finem, sed ipsam durationem denotat, seu tempus totum, quo res quaedam duravit, sed $\mu$ éxpı finem designat, quo esse desiit, nisi addatur verbum, cujus notione ipsius termini s. finis tollatur cogitatio, ut in $\mu$ éxpt ravrds." He regards the axpt кayoì as equivalent to yws тèious, i.e. «éxpi reגovs, permanently. But though right in the rale, he seems wrong in the application. The truth is, that the literal sense of Expt catpou $^{\text {a }}$ is 'during some time.' But as duration for a certain time only, necessarily implies termination at the end of that time, so ${ }^{2} \times \mathrm{pi}$ кaipoi may be
popularly taken for $\mu$ éxpt кацро甘̈. The sense here is, I conceive, well expressed by our English Versions. But although the words of the Apostle express no more than this; yet, as calpov is used, (which chiefly signifies a point of time) not xponov, he meant, I apprehend, to hint at that sense which might be more correctly phrased by $\mu$ éxpt кaцpoù; meaning by кatpoù the time of his repentance and reformation. Whether that tume would ever arrive, the Apostle, it seems, knew not ; the Holy Spirit not having informed him. And he felt so much doubt, that he only just uses an expression which might fall short of driving the man into despair. Had he felt hope, he would perhaps have said (in the words of St. Paul, Hebr. ix. 10.) ме́Xpt кaıpoî dıop0ácrese.
 Passing by the vain speculations of some Commentators on the nature of this blindness, and the unhallowed hypotheses of the sceptical school, by whom it is denied to have been produced supernaturally, I would only observe, that there is bere not an hendiadys; but it should seem that the supervention of the blindness is graphically described, by two atages of the affection. See Note on Acts iii. 8. First a cloud, as it were, came over the eyes, which soon increased to darkncss, and that terminated in utter blindness, "total eclipse, in which the Sun is dark," as Milton finely expresses it.

12. There is something awkward in this verse
 Some various readings exist, though only such as show that the antient Critics endeavoured to remove the difficulty by emendation, i. c. either by inserting doaúmacey, or making daior. and iкжл. change places. The latter mode is preferable; but it is supported by only one MS., and no reason can be assigned why, if that were the true position of the words, the verb $d \xi \in \pi-$ Anfororo should not have been written. The Syriac Translator, indeed, renders as if he so read; but he, no doubt, rather gave what he conceived to be the sense, than followed the woords of his original. Moreover, there is no example of wioreves with $\langle\pi /$ and a Dative of thing, unless where the thing is put for the person. Whereas examples of eixidijoreotal with ETi and a Dative of thing are frequent, and especially with otdax $\bar{y}$, e. gr. Matt. xxii. 33. Mark i. 22. xi. 18. Lu. iv. 32. and very often elsewhere. The same syntax is found in the Classical wri-
 conceive, meant further to unfold the sense couched in $10 \infty y$, and may be freely rendered. 'being amazed at this mode of teaching the Lord, i. e. his relipion. On this sense of didayri (of which several examples are adduced by Schleus. and Wets.) the best recent Commentators are agreed.
A.D. 48
a Intr. 15. 38.













13. of mepl тò חI.] $^{\text {] }}$ This comes under one of the three divisions into which this idiomatical use of the Article masc. plur. with an Accusative of person is distributed, i. e. as meaning the person (as principal) and his company. But if it be taken of Paul and Barnabas only, it would seem harsh. May we not, then, suppose, that some other persons had associated themeelves with them, as subordinate helpers in the work of evangelization ! That Mark had accompanied them, is certain from the next verse. This idiom being used shows that $P$ aul was already esteemed the principal, though Barnabas was, on many accounts, entitled to high consideration, and is mentioned first in the Divine appointment, v. 2.
14. iscítı $\sigma a \nu$ ] 'took their seat,' no doubt in the place where, as doctors, they had a right $t o$ sit.
15. el «̈тt- $\lambda$ ady, $\lambda$ '́yetc] ' If ye have among you any words of exhortation to the people, speak it.' This instruction and exhortation was usually taken from the portions read of the Pentateuch or Prophets.
16. катaбeías $\tau \hat{1}$ Xe! $\rho \stackrel{l}{\text { l }}$ namely, to enjoin silence. See Note on xii. 17 .

- of $\phi o \beta$. тdv $\theta \in \delta \nu$ ] By these are meant the proselytes of the gate, the of $\sigma \in \beta \dot{\beta} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 t$ т робй $\mathrm{\lambda}$ uтot. So Joseph. Ant. xiv. 7, 2. makes a similar distinction into 'Ioudaioc and reßómevoi. These persons were such as, having abandoned idolatry, worshipped the true God, and therefore, though they did not receive circumcision, were yet permitted to attend at the synagogues. Those Gentiles who recsived circumcision were reckoned as Jeus. (Kuin.) Both sorts, however, seem to be here had in view.

17. dEeג' $\xi_{a} a$ o] 'chose as objects of his peculiar blesaing.' 'Ev $\tau \bar{\eta}$ тapookía, 'during their "ojourning, i. e. when they were sojourners. " $\mathrm{X} \psi$ sooges. Elsn. and Doddr. rightly explain this, ' raised them out of a calamitous state,' referring to several passages of the Psalms, to which $I$ would add 1xix. 14. Merà $\beta \rho a x$. í $\neq \eta \lambda o \overline{\text { un , i. e. }}$ by the exertion of a mighty power. An Oriental and popular metaphor.
 cult to determine whether depoxофорทocy dгрофофо́рทаеу, the reading of some Ver: and Fathers, is to be adopted. The latter ॥ been preferred by H. Steph., Casaub.i. Mi Pfaff, Hamm., Beng., Ernesti, Pearce, WaiValckn., Morus, Schleus., Rosenm., Kuin., a Towns.; and has beea edited by Griesb. Knapp. The common reading, however, been strenuously vindicated and supported. Grot., Gataker, Deyling, Whitby, Wolf, WDoddr., Matth., and others. See al full detathe arguments for and against in Recens. Sy: Suffice it here to remark, that the externc? thority for the new reading is but slender. is only found in seven MSS., some Ver: and Fathers; whereas the common readir. supported by not only all the rest of the? and Versions, (including the Vulgate) but by passages of Origen and Chrysost. Many guments are adduced by the disputants on sides, which are either irrelevant, or incol sive. What increases the perplexity is, tha worls may easily be, and often are, confou by the scribes. Nay, in certain senses whic terms admit, the notions of the two words :1 into each other. Hence some advocates f. common reading have, in almost every pacited as authority for è $\tau \rho о$ оофор́ces, maint that roomoф. is the true reading; but wi reason. There can be no doubt but that words were in use. For though we might , whether т $\rho \circ \phi$ офорfés would be analogically ed, yet we must bend to use, (the jus et it loquendi) and another word, diфpoфopéer defend the seeming anomaly. That $\bar{\sim}$ al are interchanged in pronunciation, is an ment which draws both ways, and will 1. no decision. That the words are confound seribes, is an argument which will mat more for the new than the old reading. Yer the whole, external testimony is so decide. favour of the latter, that if that were all w to consider, it must be pronounced as pro the true reading. Internal evidence, hos is also to be taken into the account, and ti










I apprehend，strongly in favour of the new read－ ing．It is certainly the rarer and more difficult term，and is far more suitable to the context， ėfooфop．consorting better with the ü\％ooev， and ¿छrizaycu before．Nay，as Kuin．observes， ＂t the other can scarcely be borne out by facts；for it appears from Ps．xcv．10．Nebr．iii．17．and other passages，that God did not very patiently bear their perversity．＂Finally，that the word is boni cummatis，is attested by its occurring also in Deut．i． 31 ．，in 2 Mace．vii． 27 ．and in Macarius， also т $\rho о ф$ о́форos in Fustathius．Thus the in－ feriority in external is fully compensated by the superiority in internal testimony，and accord－ ingly the point might be only decided＂ad Calendus Giracus，＂were we not enabled to call in another principle，which may serve to turn the scale．No unprejudiced inquirer can doubt that the Apostle had in view Deut．i．31．； nay，Beng．and Kin．，with much probability， conjecture that Deut． i ．and Is．i．were the two chapters of the O．T．which came in course to be read that day．But，upon inspecting the passage，it will be obvious，that трофофорíc， and not трожофорíco is there the true reading． It is supported by $5-6$ hs of the MisS．，（see $\mathrm{Dr}_{\mathrm{r}}$ ． Holmes＇Sept．）and by Symm．and Aquila．，and is required there by the context．Moreover，the great bulk of the Miss．and the Hebrew require that we should read，not tpoфофорทicet，but dтрофо́pクбe．The words of the whole passage



 This is also confirmed by Numb．xi．12．Aa $\beta_{a}$


 plain that this passage too was in the mind of the Apostle，and that they are respectively images of －father carrying his little son over the rough places of a road，and of a nurse carrying her infant charge in her bravo．There，I conceive， the image terminates，and does not extend to feed－ ing，which some antient Interpreters seem to have thought，as we may infer from the Const．Aport． vii．36．，Hesych．，and the antient Syriac，the Arabic．Coptic，and Ethiopic，and two very ancient Latin Versions．If，however，it should be maintained，that the Apostle meant to come． bine the images of the foregoing passages．I would not strenuously contradict it．He that os it may，the question at issue must be decided in favour of orpoфoфópクoa．And，let it be borne in mind．that the enteral testimony，as far
as concerns Versions and Fathers，is in favour of ${ }^{\text {E }}$ T $\rho o \phi o \phi .$, and that，though the evidence of MSS．for $\dot{\text { i }}$ ，$\rho=\pi$ o $\phi$ ．may seem quite overbearing， yet it is all negative evidence；and it is probable that many of the collated MSS．have dTpoфоф．， and still more of the uncollated，which have recently been examined by the diligent Scholz．

19．катек入ท $\rho$ oóór $\eta \sigma \in \nu$ ］．Many MSS．have катєк $\lambda \eta \rho о \nu \dot{\rho} \mu \nu \sigma \in \nu$ ，which is preferred by Grot． and Mill，and adopted by Wets．，Math．，Griesb．， Knapp，and Tittm．There is much to be said both ways，but no sufficient reason for change． I suspect that катак入 проòoteo，as being a com－ paratively rate，was changed into the very com－ mon term катаклпроуоціш．Besides，the $\mathbf{N}$ and $\Delta$ are often confounded．And perhaps the Apostle had in mind two kindred passages of Deut．i．38．and Josh．xix．51．where ${ }^{6} \kappa \lambda \eta \rho o-$ $\delta \dot{o} \boldsymbol{r} \eta \sigma \in$ is the reading of the best MSS．

20．air direct tet．kail r．］As to the discre－ nancy between this number and that at 1 Kings vi．1．，we need not suppose an error cither in one or the other，though the N．T．number is confirmed by Josephus；but（with Mr．Towns．） take the words to mean：＇and after these things， which lasted about the space of 450 years，he gave them judges，until Samuel the Prophet，＇ i．e．from the time that God chose the fathers， （which some fix to the birth of Isaac）to the time the land was divided to them by lot，was nearly 450 years ；and then God appointed judges in Israel．Or we may suppose（with Lights．and Perizon．）that in this number are reckoned the years of the tyrants who occasionally held Israel in subjection during the dynasty of the Judges； and which，when added，make up exactly 450. Thus no error will attach to either passage，and only different modes of computation be supposed to be adopted．
21．ixeiter］This is properly used of place； but sometimes of time，as here and in Yen．cited by Kain．＂En tecoapdкovta．The truth of this is attested by Josephus．And the Apostle probably derived his information from the same source as the historian，namely，the antient records which，he tells＇wo，were preserved in the Temple．
 compounded of Ps．Ixxxix．21．and 1 Sam．xiii． 14．，with some slight modification，on which mode of citing from the O ．T．see Note on vii． 7. Avdp aa кат $\dot{\alpha}$ tiv карoiav，viz．in his unde－ rating pursuit of the plans God would have carried into effect，and in accomplishing His purposes．Өe入ipard $\mu$ on，wishes．The plural is rare，but it occurs in 2 Parl．ix． 12.
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 edit, from several MSS., and some Versions and Fathers, ${ }^{4} \gamma a \gamma e$, supposing the common reading to be a gloss. But that cricicism will not apply to an expression which occurs no where else, and is too harsh to be likely to have been used once. It is truly observed by Wets.: "'Eyeipect owтйpa scribitur Jud. iii. 9 \& 15. áyety $\sigma \omega \neq \bar{p} \rho a$ nusquam." For $\sigma \infty \tau \hat{\eta} \rho \boldsymbol{\rho}$ 'I. Matth. edits $\sigma \infty \pi n-$ piav; but rastly; for, as Mill long ago remarked, that reading arose from a mistake in the abbreviation-E®THPIN. Eaor. does not, as Matthei thought, require the Article, because (as Middl. suggests) " nouns in apposition, not explanatory of the essence of the preceding noun, but of the end or object, are always anarthrous." See also Lu. ii. 11 .
 Hebr. לפך, and aimply signifies before. Elcódov, ' entrance upon his office;' in which sense the word is used in the Classical writers. On $\beta \dot{d} \boldsymbol{\pi} \tau$. Metavoias, see Note on Matt. iii. 2.

25. wis $d \pi \lambda$ ' $\rho \rho 00]$ Render, 'when he was finishing his course,' i. e. towards the close of his course, or mixistry. Tiva is taken by many eminent Commentators for övriva, in the sense 'I am not he whom you suppose me to be.' And they adduce examples; yet not one where the tis commences a sentence. It is therefore better to take the riva (according to the common interpretation) as interrogative, and then suppose, in the next sentence, an ellip. of oüros; which, when Christ is meant, is often, through reverence, suppressed. There is, besides, more spirit in this construction.
26. ol $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ катозкoūvтes] The $y \dot{\alpha} \rho$ is not eausal, but has reference to some clause omitted, and may be rendered etenim.

- тойтоу dyvoทㅎavtes-d $\lambda \lambda$ ทipwoav] There is here a difficulty of constuction, to remove which several eminent Commentators suppose a a transposition, taking кpivavtes with roüroy, and dyvoríaures with $\tau \alpha \dot{s}$ фowas, assigning the following sense: ' They who dwell at Jerusalem in condemning Him, not having known the voices of the prophets, which are read every
sabbath day, have fulfilled [the prophecier] But this does too much violence to the constru: tion to be admitted. It is better, with Gre. Wolf, and Kuin., to take dynovicavres as the longing to both toürov and (by adaptation signification) to $\tau \dot{d} \boldsymbol{s} \phi$ cosais $\tau$. T., in the sen-1 not knowing Him to be the the Messiah, a: not understanding the Scriptures.' At крivav(for катакр.) sub. aiviv taken from roint preceding, and render: ' by condemning.' rvoウjбauree cannot be again supplied at $\dot{e} \pi \lambda$ prooav, yet it is implied, the meaning being, it they unwittingly fulfilled the prophecies. Joseph. Bell. iv. 6, 8. adverting to such propt



29. каөе入ónтег- $\mu \nu \eta \mu$ еіо $]$ There has bet difficulty started, that "the same persons w condemned Jesus did not bury him.' To rem which, some Commentators would take
 indeed, active yerbs are sometimes taiken y sively, or even impersonally. But the princi is here inapplicable, and savours 400 much device for the nonce; as does also the met of supplying Ioudaio. Grot. and Rasel suppose the Article omitted; by which the st will be, 'those who took him down,' mear Joseph and his companions. But this is for, a sense on the passage which is not intend for to express that, the Article must have $t$ used, it being, as Bp. Middl. observes, in a instances never omitted. Nay, as he furthe' marks, even this would not remove the oh tion; for Joseph and his companions did take down the body, but the executioners. regards the wording as a trifing inaccuracy, wthe Apostle, hastening to the grand subjec the Resurrection, cared not to avoid. It however, be doubted whether there be an: accuracy at all. It seems to be only a pol form of expression, by which any one is sa do what he procures or permits to be dord another. Those who brought about his ci fixion might be familiarly said to bring hi his grave, though they did not deposit him il









 15



What the Apostle meant to say is this, that when they had (unwittingly) done all that was predicted of him (up to his death) they had him taken down and buried, and thought there was an end of him. This last clause, though not expressed, is perhaps alluded to in the adversative $\delta \dot{\delta}$, which commences the next sentence, - But not so;-God raised him' \&c.
 a certain perplexity of construction, which some seek to remove by taking izaryediay for the fulfiment of the promise. But that is straining the interpretation. It is better, with many eminent Commentators, to suppose a sort of synchysis, by which the raürnv just after is redundant, thus: eं To which method they resort, because an Accus. of thing after that of person with eva $\gamma \gamma$. is, they say, unexampled. A somewhat bold assertion, which seems contradicted by this passage, in which the Accus. of thing may be accounted for by supposing it to refer to déroutes, which is involved in civary., by a sort of signifcatio pragnans. At least, this must be supplied at

33. viós $\mu$ ou-ore] By this reference it is indirectly asserted, that Jesus was the Messiah. For though the words have an application to David, (see Pearce in Recens. Synop.) yet they appear to have a primary and more important reference to Christ; at least, they well admit of an accomunodation to Him . By his resurrection Jesus was emphatically declered to be the Son of God. And, as Bp. Pearce well observes, "it is with peculiar propriety and beauty that God is said to have begotten Christ on the day of his resurrection, as he then seemed to be bora out of the earth anew."
 that " it might be inferrod that the resurrection in question would be final and permanent, from the words which God had spoken by His prophet (Is.1v. 3.) as follows: 'I will give,' \&c."' The
 merely introduces jajow, because in the clause in question it is to be supplied from the preceding one dcaӨriao $a, ~ \& c$. And thus it is supplied in Bp. Lowth s. version. "Oata is by most interpreters explained ' mercies ;' by some 'benefits,' which latter is preferable. But Tittm. de Synon. p. 25. denies that the öria can mean this; and
he, with Bp. Pearce, takes the sense of räöacato be literally 'the sacred things of David,' i.e. the covenamt made with Daxid and confirmod by an oath. And thus $\tau \dot{a}$ ö $\sigma \iota a \pi$ тıora will be equivalent to the 广pкıa mıotaं of Homer. But there is surely a sreater difficulty in regarding tä öcia as taken in so far-fetched a sense. And unless we suppose that the Sept. I ranslators entirely mistook the sense of the Hebrew "Ton, we can scarcely render otherwise than 'the benefits mercifully promised;' as in 2 Paral. vi. 42. Schleus. in his Lex. adduces an example of this sense of $\tau \boldsymbol{d} \boldsymbol{\partial} \sigma$ oov from Clemens. Ep. ad Corinth.
 $\mu e v$ öta. There can be little doubt that the Hellenistic Jews at that time so understood the word.
35. Here the Apostle strengthens the argument from another passage, where lifin dia $\phi$. signifies 'to experience corruption,' which results from permanent death. He then proceeds to show that those words are not applicable to David; and then leaves it to be inferred that the person there meant must be Jesus, the only one who had been so raised from the dead as not to return thither, or experience corruption.
36. The construction here has been thought doubtful; since imnporijas may be construed either with ldia yeveă, or with tỹ roü Өeoü goun $\bar{y}$. The former method is adopied by some Interpreters and the E.V.; but the latter is the more natural construction, and yields a better sense, and such as is very applicable to one who was a man after God's own beart by accomplishing His purposes. See V .22 . It is also confirmed by the antient Versions, and by the use of the word in the Classical writers, where ive $\eta \rho \in e$ eiv is often followed by a noun signifying wishes, compnands \$x. 'Idia reveq̄, ' in his own generation' or time. See Lu. xvi.8.
 derived from the O.T. (as Gen. xlix. 29 . xxv. 8. Judg. ii. 10.) There is an allusion in it to those vast cacos, or subterraneous vaults, in which the Hebrews (as also the Fisyptians, Babylonians, and other Oriental nations) used to deposit the dead of a whole family or race, sometimes arranged in recesses by the side of the vault, and cometimes laid upon each other, until a cave or pit was quite full of the bodies.
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38. The Apostle now applies the doctrine which he has already stated and proved, and proceeds to show the benefits to be obtained by faith in the Messiahship of Jesus, and to point out the great superiority of the justification and remission of sins to be attained through Him over that supplied by the Law of Moses. The two modes are well contrasted by Doddr. in Recens. Synop.
40. To an encouragement to faith, intended for the well disposed, the Apostle subjoins a warning for the refractory. 'EL roil $\pi \rho o \phi$., i.e. that division of the O.T. called the Prophets. See Note on Joh. vi. 45.
41. idect \&c.] A citation from Habak. i. 5., (though a similar apostrophe in Is. xxviii. 14. may have been in the mind of St. Paul) in which a word is omitted not necessary to the sense, and one or two supplied to make it clearer. Both the Apostle and the LXX. vary from the Hebrew as regards of катафроиทтal and dфaviotnte, in the former instance preserving the true reading, which seems to be not בנוים, but בנדים, which is read in some MSS. and confirmed by the Syriac and Arabic Versions. With $\alpha \phi a \nu$. there is more of difficulty. The common version - Perish' is generally considered indefensible, as not even warranted by the Hebrew ; and Beza, Doddr., Pearce, Wakef., Schleus., Wahl, and Kuin. render 'disappear,' viz. for shame and fear; a sense which Schleus. thinks reconcilable with the Hebrew, since $\quad$ wu signifies both vastari and stupere. If so, the LXX. took the worse signification. But probably they read differently, namely, instead of חמנהו, they read ורששמו, i. e. be exceedingly amazed. This I suspect to be the true reading in the Hebrew; for the letters might easily be confounded, and a 9 lost after a 9. Thus there will be a climax; being a far stronger term (namely, to be destroyed, i. e. die with amazement) than תמתה. What idea St. Paul himself would have affixed to the word as it respected the prophecy, we cannot know. But it should seem that he took occasion from the ambiguity of signification to hint to his unbelieving hearers a warning as to the consequinces of their unbelief and rejection of the Messiah. The " work" was the ruin of their country, which certainly happened in their time, since it was not many years afterwards.
42. There is in this verse much diversity of reading, and consequently variety of interpretstons. Almost all recent Editors are agreed is inserting aüTöv (for which there is great authrity in MSS., Versions, Fathers, and early Fd. and cancelling $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ т with as great authority. Math., however, frtrains the $\tau \dot{\alpha} \dot{a} \theta v a$, which may certainly be tole. rated if they be taken to denote the Jewish proselytes, mentioned in the next verse. But th words are probably from the margin; as also. should seem, are ix tris-'Ioudaions, though ti. objection which Kun. makes to rain 'I (that being useless and offensive) is refuted by xiv. 1 And after all, both the passages may be genuine. and have been excluded by the early Critics: the same grounds (some of them false) that th r are objected to by Kin. Or perhaps rein only may have come from the margin, as mesa to demote the subject of the participle ¿غtóvr: as $\tau a^{*} \epsilon \theta \eta$ would seem to be meant to sup; that of the verb mapendiovv. There is ne more frequent cause of marginal glosses ( $0: 1$ introduced into the text) than when vertu participles absolute are put without a subj, In the present instance $\tau \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ 'I seems to $h$

 introduced, 1 suspect, after tenn' $\mathbf{I}$. The w: passage may be thus rendered: ' As they ( Paul and Barnabas) were departing from synagogue, (they, i.e. the congregation, or Gentile proselytes) expressed a desire that I! words might be spoken to them (ie. that same subject should be treated of) on the sabbath day. And when the synagogue broken up, many of the Jews and devout selytes followed Paul and Barnabas.' Paul Barnabas did not go out, as Kuin. is pleas take for granted, before the conclusion of the vice; for the service, except a brief conclu prayer, terminated with the disconerse; bu are only to understand that they went out accompanied probably by the rulers of the : gigue; the people meanwhile reverently h ing their seats; and on their having lief: place, the whole congregation broke up departed.
The words cis $\tau \dot{d} \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \xi \dot{v} \sigma \dot{\alpha} \beta \beta$. are by









 $\nu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\text { and }}$


eminent Commentators supposed to mean 'on some intermediate week day.' But that sense is refuted by $\mathbf{v} .44$., and the sense expressed in our common Version is, no doubt, the true one, and is adopted by the best recent Commentutors, as well as confirined by the antient Viersons. Merak in the later writers has often the sense post. It is here put for нетa тойто.
 their belief of the Gospel, called kat' Ex in The grace of God, " as containing (says Doddr.) the richest display of his grace, $i$. e. the free pardon of our sins by Christ, and the provision he hath made for our sanctification and eternal happiness." See Rom. vi. 4. Col.1.6. Titus. ii. 11. 1 Pet. v. 12.
 edit, from seven MSs., exoméyon, which Rinck approves, because $\dot{\epsilon} \chi о \mu$ ever is, he says, the more learned and apt reading. Now this would be well judged in an elegant Classic: but for that very reason $\dot{\Phi} \mathbf{x} \mu$. may be suspected to have come from the untient Critics. Especially as the Mss. in which it is found are mostly such as have been altered. And as $\tau \hat{\eta}$ ie $\dot{c} \rho x o \mu e ́ v y$ sail. ŋृце́ pa is found not unfrequently in Joseph., nay, єтоия єохомецош in Thucyd., who has not a few archaisms, we may suppose that this use of $\delta \rho X$. for ex ce $X$. was an idiom of the popular dialect, probably derived from antique and perhaps Oriental use.
45. aivtiléyovres anal $\beta \lambda$.$] 'both contradict-$ ing and reviling,' i. e. adding insult to opposition. 'Avail. cai are omitted in several MSS. and Versions, and marked as probably to be cancelled by Griesb. But they were manifestly thrown out by the carly Critics, who, it seems, stumbled at the uncommonness of the phraseology. The ivavtioúnevoc for avoid.. found in a few MiSsis. and preferred by Grot., Beza, and Beng., is a mere gloss, though a good explanation.
46. dvarkaīov] i. e. by being so ordained in the counsels of God.

- кai oüx dそious-ケcaฑ̄] ie. since you act as if ye judged yourselves unworthy of, \&.c. Whether a metonymy, as the Commentators regand it, or not, this is certainly a delicate turn,
such as is found in the best writers, from whom examples are adduced by Wets.
- $\sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ф о ́ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ cis $\tau \dot{c} \dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \eta$ ] We are not to understand by this, that Paul abandoned all the Jews, and became the Apostle of the Gentiles only; for he became such much later, and even then never to the abandonment of the Jews. Hero the Jews of Antioch alone are meant; and by the $\tau \alpha \dot{\alpha} H \nu \eta$ not the Gentiles at large, nor even the Gentiles of Antioch only, but chiefly the Gentile proselytes before mentioned, though the Gentiles at large must be included, since the Apostle would be as ready to admit them as converts, as he had been to admit the Proconsul. That he deemed himself at full liberty to do this, is plain from the application which he gives to the words of Isaiah xix. 6., which he now adduces as his authority.

47. té $\theta$ cixá $\sigma \epsilon$ cis $\phi$ wis Sic.] The words exactly correspond to the I.XX., at least in the Alexandrian and other MSS., though the common text (of the Vatican MS.) has ócidoosa for Tex $\theta$ ens $\alpha$, which is the more literal version of the Hebrew, of which ref. is a free rendering. In the common text are added els isaOíchu yeayous, of which the sense is, ' as a bequest to the nation.' But I suspect the words to have come from the margin. Tet $\theta$ inca should be rendered, 'I have appointed,' or 'ordained.' It is strange that Ruin. should consider this passage as propertly applicable to Isaiah only and his calling to the prophetical office, and only accommodated by St. Paul to his own case. The words are scarcely applicable to the Prophet at all, and there are many parts of the Chapter from whence this passage is taken that cannot possibly apply to the Prophet, and have no propriety but as referred to the Messiah, " whose character and office (to use the words of Bp. Iowth) was exhibited in general terms at the beginning of Chap. ali., but here is introduced in person, declaring the full extent of his commission; which is not only to restore the Israelites, and reconcile them to their Lord and Father, from whom they had so often revolted; but to be a light to lighten the Gentiles, to call them to the knowledge and obedience of the true God, and to bring them to be one church together with the




Israelites, and to partake with them of the same common salvation procured for all by the, great Redeemer and Reconciler of man to God." This passage of the Prophet might well be said to be their warrant for preaching to the Gentiles, and in some sense contained an injunction, since the Messiah could only be a light and salvation to the Gentiles by the means of those who should spread his Gospel. Paul, however, himself had received a sort of positive injunction, since (as we find from Acts $\times x$ xi. 17) on his first visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, Jesus appeared to him in a trance and said, "Depart, for I will send thee hence far of to the Gentiles."
 mended it, acknowledged the excellency of it, as worthy the impartiality of the God of the whole universe.
 few passages of which the interpretation is 80 disputed as the present; and no wonder, since it has been so much viewed through the spectacles of party and system. Most Calvinistic Interpreters explain tetaynévot els fore-ordained, or predestinated unto, by Gnd's decree; the persons in question being represented as believing under that decree. In refutation of this, some AntiCalvinistic Commentators rather apply themselves to show that the doctrines of Calvinism are untenable, than that they cannot be found here. But the only question before us is, the sense of the words reraynévoc els ̧amiv alwivò. Now there would seem no vestige of any sense of an absolute decree, or predestination. The expression is not mpoтeта $\gamma \mu$ évor (much less, as invariable custom elsewhere would require, трошрıг $\mu$ évol) but simply reтaymévos. There is neither z $\rho o$ nor any equivalent word or phrase. There is, besides, no mention of God, no umd toü $\theta \in o u ̄$, as we might expect. All which objections are strongly urged by Grot., Hamm., Wolf, Whitby, and A. Clarke. If, however, those were all that could be urged against the sense in question, they might perhaps be deemed insufficient. For тeтaypéyor might, though there is no proof of any such sense either in the Scriptural or Classical writers, mean destined; and so it is rendered by Morus, Kosenm., Schott, Kuin., Wahl, and others, who, however, are very far from adopting the notion of an absolute decree. In fact, they explain away the sense. If, however, destined were supposed to be the sense, I do not think the argument drawn from the omission of úrd $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{u}$ Өeou would be of much weight, since it might be understood, as in Eph.
 the sense which the Calvinists affix might, after all, be tolerated, if the context would permit it. But that is by no means the case. There is assuredly nothing, either in the context, or in the language which St. Luke has used heretofore in this Book, or in his Gospel, that can lead us to suppose that he meant to express any such sense here; nay, there is not a little that utterhy eccludes it. See the masterly Notes of Hamm. and Whithy in Recens. Synop. Suffice it to
say, that it is forbidden by the word $\mathrm{d} \boldsymbol{\pi}$ ioceocs, which, under the present circumstances, an mean no more than, that they believed in the Divine mission of Jesus, and received the religion which he came to promulgate. Yee it cannot be supposed that all that did so were predestined to eternal salvation. We do not fisd those who believed at other times were predestined; some falling away, as is represented in the parable of the Sower. Nor is it likely thas such should come in all at once, but gradually. 'Exiotevaly, then, can have no reference to their persevering, or not persevering. Besides, as the best Commentators are agreed (see Grot., Hamm., Whitby; and Schoettg.) there is here an opposition, arising from a tacit comparison between the conduct of these Gentiles on the one hand, and of the Jews on the other. The Gentiles, reraypévot eis Yuiv aidy., and who accordingly received the ciospel, are contrasted with the Jews mentioned at y. 46., who, by rejecting it, acted as if they," thought themselves not worthy of eternal life." See Krebs and Wets. And as no absolute decree can, by the words
 posed in the latter case, (see the able Note of Whitby) so none must be supposed in the former.
Having now seen what cannot be the meaning of the words, let us examine what is probably their sense. In the first place, we must not adopt the construction of many considerable Interpreters, who would connect els Yoorio with
 Yoviv alíviov, ) because it is too violent, ani requires an unauthorized sense of $\zeta$ coriv alcosios. The natural construction must be preserveci and such a sense assigned to teray. as may $t$. suitable to eis yoviv aloiviov, and be permitted 1. the usage of the Scriptural as well as the Clasical writers. Many eminent Commentator fancy a military metaphor, and take the sento be 'those who had arrayed themselves ic salvation,' namely, by hearing the word of Gc and not resisting the work of the Holy Spirit c their hearts. They take the passive here in reciprocal sense, than which use nothing is mo common. See Dresig de verbis mediis N.T. 24. But there is something so far-fetched this military metaphor, that almost all the abo. Commentators abandon it when they descend full explanation. It should seem best neither fancy any deeply recondite Theological myste nor to suppose any far-fetched allusion; but take the words in their plain and popular sen Now tágनectal els signifies to be thoroue dirposed for, to be purposed for, bent or ; as lviii. 1." "Are your minds set upon righteo ness?" So the Greek eidectos civat cis. In these senses the reciprocal force is quite inhers And any one of them, or that of Doddrid version 'determined for,' may be assigned in present passage. See the examples of the at signification adduced by Krebs, Loesner, others, to which may be added 2 Macc. vi.
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"those who are disposed for compassion." The recent Commentators, (and among the rest Bp. Middl.) bring forward as most apposite a citation of Loesner from Max. Tyr. Diss. v. dal
 however, that they should have passed by the ouv in that passage. Had they referred to the two last and best Editions, those of Davies and Reiske, they would have seen that ouyretay$\mu$ evos is there edited by both. Yet as that is only on conjecture, we may be allowed to propose, and I would read, tetaymivos, bent upon. The oun expresed in MSS. by $\sigma$, might easily be aboorbed in the s preceding. I would add an apposite passage from Bulkley's heterogeneous heap, Plato de Legg. vi. p. 563 ., where he speaks of a фüots els diperì retaynévn, 'well or fully disposed to virtue.' It is plain that Chrysost: must have taken this view of the sense, since he observes that the expression retaynévot is used to show that the thing is not a matter of necessity.
50. т ${ }^{2}$ ' eiveximovar] ' women of rank.' See Note on Mark xv. 43.

- dEépanop], i.e. ' were the means of their being driven.' 'BEipalow dंबd tay joicon may soem strong terms. For (though the Commentators do not appear aware of it) we need not suppose that force was employed in removing them ; which, as no resistances was made, would have been unnecessary. This kind of order for departure used to be given in due form, and there were sometimes persons appointed to superintend the execution of it, by conducting the person over the borders. So Thucyd. ii. 12. kal

 on Matt. 1.14.

52. xapâs] 'the consolations of the Gospel.' חveín, dy. This must be explained of the gits and graces of the Holy Spirit for sanctification, not for morking miracles, since hands had not been laid upon them for that purpose. Bp. Kaye in his admirable work on the Ecclesiastical History of the three first Centuries, righty lays this down as a criterion for deciding on the presence or absence of the power of working miracles.
XII.. 1. кaтà to autd] The earlier Com. mentators suppose an ellip. of iCos. But it is
better, with the later ones, to take it as equiva-
 $\mu \mu \mathrm{ov}$, and both expressions being used by the LXX. to express the Hebr. 7rr. 'Eג入invay, put for ' $\mathrm{B} \lambda \lambda \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\nu} \tau \sigma \tau \omega \nu$, Jewish proselytes.
53. $\alpha \pi e t \theta$ oürres] 'refusing belief, unbelieving,' $\mu \eta$ intoré̃ovtes. A sense occurring also at xvil. 5. xix. 9. Joh. iii. 36. Heb. xi. 31., but rarely found in the Classical writers. Yet it occurs in Hom. Od. y. 43. It generally means to refuse obedience.
 maintain that the true construction is, $d \pi l$ rds


 from xiii. 50. Yet perhaps those words are meant to be referred also to dкáкcooav, two clauses being thus blended into one. Render, 'instigated aud embittered the minds of the Gentiles against the brethren ;' of which sense of како́w examples are adducel from Josephus. This verse is parenthetical, and therefore the $\mu \mathrm{e} v$ oüy at the beginning of the next verse may retain its usual signification, and be rendered ' accordingly.' It has also a resumptive force.
 tors take this to mean ' being bold in the profeasion of Jexus,' i.e. in his doctrine and cause. But perhaps that would require dv $\tau \bar{\omega} \kappa$. It is better, with Grot., Pisc., Mor., Kuin., and Schleus., to render 'speaking freely, in reliance on the Lord,' i.e. on Christ, as most Commentators explain, or, as Grot. and Kuin. understand, God. Similar uncertainties of interpretation often occur; bat they at least strongly attest the grand doctrine of the Deity of Christ!
The кal before dedónct is omitted in many of the best MSS. and Versions, and in almost all early Edd. It crept into the later Erasmian Editions, and was thence introduced into the third of Steph. It has been, very properly, cancelled by Matth., Griesb., Knapp, and Vater, both from internal evidence (since we may account for its omission, but not for its insertion) and from propriety of language; for (as Rinck observes) where a later participle is meant for the explication of a preceding one [and denoting by means, i. c. how the copulative is usually absent, as at v. 17 \& 22. See Note on ix. 28. Al=o
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Middle．Gr．A．iii．3．4．Wakef．has well rem－ dered，＇by granting．＇All such participles should be similarly rendered．

4．$\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \chi^{i} \sigma \theta_{\eta}$ ］＇was divided in opinion．＇When oxiSco甘ia，which signifies to be split，has the metaphorical sense to dissent，y沙位s is gene－ rally added by way of explanation，though some－ times omitted，as here and in two passages of Aenoph．and Diod．Sic．，cited by the Com－ mentators．

5．óянi］This is by some rendered impetus assault．But that sense is negatived by the audioovtes at v．6．The best Commentators take it to denote impulse，of which sense Munthe adduces several examples．In those passages， however，the word is used with ivérere，and here it rather seems to denote a set design，full



6．ovvเò $\frac{1 \nu}{\nu} \epsilon \epsilon$ ］＇having come to a knowledge ［of the design］．＇A sense of the word frequent in the later writers．
－tass mó久ers $\tau$ ins $\mathbf{A}$.$] Here the Article is$ not without force，though that is not expressed by our Translators．Nor need the Commentators have supposed a transposition，thus：катéфuyov cis $\Lambda$ ．cal $\Delta$ ．vas modes tips A ．；for then the Article would have been improper even in the Greek，Iconium being a city of consequence． The truth is，that $\Lambda \dot{v} \sigma \tau \rho a \nu$ and $\Delta \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \beta \eta \nu$ fall under the rule of apposition for definition＇s sake， （ie．to determine the whole by specifying the parts．See Math．Gr．Gr．© $431 \& 432$ ）and the use of the Article falls under that of insertions in hypothesis；also the words $\tau \bar{\eta} s$ Aukaovias are added by way of explication．If the Article， however，be allowed its force，it would be cere－ tain that St．Luke did not reckon Iconium as in Lycaonia．And yet Strabo，Pliny，and Staph． 13yz．do．But Xenophon in his Cyrop．reckons it in Phrygian，though on the borders of Lycaonia． And probably so it continued till the Roman
conquest，and even then was popularly res； as in Lycaonia．
8．＇кর́Өทro］Wakef．and Kain．stumi the sense sat，and render＇was＇or dwelt ： quant sense of к $\alpha^{\dot{\alpha}} \theta_{\eta \mu a}$ ，derived from the aw．And this interpretation is confirm i the antient Syr．let I prefer the comm： nification，meant，it should seem，to graphically the condition of this poor $w$ who had never walked．Adúvaros．Not or infirm，or disabled，as some English I lators render；but helpless in his feet， Wakef，expresses it，who had no use of hi Xoolós．Not lame，as Newt．and Wake．ry but a cripple，ie．according to the true a ion of that word（not perceived by the 1 logists，and which is suggested by the odd $\leq 1$ of the word）creepie，one who can only This is distinctly stated in the next ＂Hove，was hearing or listening to．

10．ク̈入入ето каi терtєт．］See Note on iii． 8.

11．Auкaonort ］On the precise natur character of this language the learned a agreed．The most probable opinion is， 1 was of Greek origin，but，by coalition wi languages of Asia Minor，peculiarity of nunciation，and other causes，had become ： a distinct language from the Greek．St． evidently did not understand what was si otherwise he would have prevented the gre ton for sacrifice．
 that the Gods especially frequented those which were sacred to them．From v． 13. pears that Jupiter had a temple，and it i－ bable，from what is there said，that the cit sacred to him．It was likely，therefore，th it should appear；of course，in a human for also that he should be accompanied by Me； since．Jupiter was believed to be general companied on such visits by Mercury．













－ò ทं speaker．＇Thus Mercury is called by Jambl．


13．o iepeis］The Commentators take this for doxiepeis，as often；and they have shown that a High Priest was sometimes so called among the heathens．Hut unless there were seceral priests of Jupiter，this will not hold good．The Article will decide nothing either way．At roù Aıòs Kuin．supposes an ellip．of iepoū，as in Aristoph． Plut．35४．їкеся тарі той Өeoū．and often． Perhaps，however，there is no ellip．at all，but only Jupiter put for the temple of Jupiter，the God for the temple，by a common figure of speech；for Valckn．has shown that it cannot be understood of a stutue，because statues had no Priests attached to them．The above view is，I find，supported by 13p．Middl．，who adduces an apposite proof of this idiom from P＇ausan．iv． p．3\％7．Mavtıкдos de каi тd lepò Mєббŋ－
 тeixous ó $\theta$ eds inovuévos，which evidently means that the Temple in which stood a statue of Hercules，was without the wall．The temple being situated in fromt of the city shows that Jupiter（thus mрoтodos）was accounted the rontoũyor or tutelary God of the place．
－бтеццата］＇chaplets，＇to place around the horns of the bulls．There is here no hen－ diadys，as some suppose．Mu入conas．It is not clear of what we are to understand them；whe－ ther of the gates of the city，or the portals of the tomple，or the porch of the house where the Apostles were．
 sive of grief and detectation at hearing blas－ phemy．See Matt．xxvi． 65.

15．$\dot{\text { ócotaracis］This is not well rendered }}$ by Doddr．and Newc．＇of like infirmities，＇nor by Wakef．，＇of like weaknesses．＇Still less should it be rendered，with Yearce and Weston，＇mor－ tals subject to death．＇The term opotza0ris is too complex a one to be adequately represented by any such opecial expression．In fact $\dot{d} \theta \rho \rho 0$ rot is emphatic，q．d．We are men，not Gods． And omotr．，as is plain from the Classical cita－ tions adduced by Wets．，denotes the being sub－ ject to all those accidents which attach to mor－ tality，namely，the passions and affections，the
wants and weaknesses，the liability to disease and death，to which flesh is heir；all the very reverse to the idea connected with the God－ head．
－tout．tṑv Mataíovy Many Commenta－ tors take this in the masculine，and understand the statues of the God，deıктısios；which，they think，is required by the antithetical Өeoss そiov． But it is doubtful whether the words were pro－ nounced at the Temple－gate：certainly not in the temple．It is better，with others，to refer the words to the osen and garlands．It should seem，however，that the Apostle meant，in a general way，the rites and ceremonies of idolatry， as in 1 kings xvi．2．toū mapopyíal $\mu \in$ है rois Maraiots aüraiv．and Joseph．Ant．x．4， 1.
 dumb idols，stocks，and stones．See Note on Matt．xvi． 16.

16．тávtr тà é $\theta \nu \eta$ ］Not all nations，（which would not be agreeable to facts）but all the nations，ניט，the（irntiles．（Pearce and Markl．） Mopev́ध $\sigma$ at tais $\dot{\text { ob }}$ ．a．，to follow the course of their own imaginations respecting the Divine worship；and to whom he had not given a reve－ lation of his will either by Divine legates or by Revelation．The ciage，however，does not im－ ply allorance，but abandonment．See Whitby．

17．nai toi $\gamma \in$ ］＇And yet，at least．＇Oún
 being without testimony as to existence，nature， properties，\＆c．There is an elegant meinsis in
 adduced many examples on Thucyd．ii．41．ov
 меvot．
－imiv］For this many MSS．，Versions，and Fathers have $\dot{u} \mu \mathrm{i} \nu$ ；and a little after for $\dot{j} \mu \omega \nu$, insiy．Both these readings are received by Ǵriesb．，Knapp，and Tittm．；and I should have followed them，notwithstanding the insufficiency of external testimony，（for in words so similar that is next to nothing）had I not suspected the readings to be emendations of the Alexandrian school．And though $\dot{\dot{v}} \mu \bar{i} \nu$ and $\dot{\nu} \mu \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ would be more agreeable to strict propriety，yet rimiv and クi $\mu \omega \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{y}$ have more of nature and simplicity．The Apostle speaks（throush delicacy）коьш＂s，q．d． ＇you as well as us，both of us．＇There is in oüpa－
 $\ddagger \dot{\eta} \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$. каí таи̂та $\lambda$ é $\frac{1}{}$入ous tồ $\mu \dot{\eta}$ Өúeıv aúroís.
१ 2 Cor. 11. 2 2, The 3
r supr. 11 . 2
et 13 43
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ขótev veroòs diobours something, together with the simplicity of early times, almost poetic. So
 $\pi a \rho d$. which passage was prolably in the mind of the Apostle, and if so, it will add another to the proofs (few in number) that he was not unacquainted with the Greek Classical writers; and it is curious that one of the passages alluded ${ }^{t}$ o is from this same Aratus. See xvii. 28. and Note. 'Yecoús. The plural is used with reference to the two periodical rains called by James v . 7 .
 кacoois ietious. The plural is rare ; yet Lucian i. 104. has ievol re jaroaioo kal piatoo. The term denotes continued and heavy rain.
17. $\alpha \mu \pi \star \pi \lambda \bar{\omega} \nu-\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \bar{\omega} \nu$ Grut., Triller, and Schleus. attempt to remove the apparent harshness of this phraseology by taking ei ei poorivys of wine, and $\tau \alpha \varepsilon$ карòias in the sense stomachs. A more ill-founded and tasteless criticism cannot well be imagined. Little better is that of Rosenm. and Kuin., who take tas ка $\rho \dot{\partial} \dot{a}$ г $\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$, by Hebraism, for $\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\varepsilon}$. There need not be any perplexity. We have only to suppose a sort of synchysis and brachylogia. The sense fully expressed would be, 'filling our stomachs with food and our hearts with gladness.'
19. кal жeícautes-izupov] The full sense, which is obscured by brevity, is, 'And having prevailed on the multitude to stone Paul, they, after having stoned him, drew him,' \&c. A九 $\theta \dot{\alpha}-$ aautes may, however, be rendered 'and having procured him to be stoned.' There is a similar construction at xii. 20. кal тєíбavtes B. ŋु่тойעто elprívŋע.

- עopioavres à̀тov tefvàval] There is no sort of foundation for the irreverent fancy of Pric. and Wets. that Paul pretended to be dead. He was, no doubt, in a swoon and senseless; and when we consider that he had been stoned at least almost to death, we shall see that his being enabled to walk home, and the next day to set out for Derbe, can be regarded in no other light than as preternatural.
 in our common version. The sense is, 'by exhorting them.' See Note suprav. 3. In кal ött jcid \&c. there is (as Kuin. well observes) an idiom by which another word of cognate signi-
fication is to be supplied from one which ha: preceded, i.e. $\lambda$ éyouter from mapaxaloüric:
 recent Commentators, be confined to that tic but extended to every age ; in which the wo: will, mutatis mutandis, be found true. St Chrysost.

23. Xetpotovíavies a.] Erasm., Calvis Beza, and, more latterly, Knatchb.: RapiDoddr., and all the Presbyterian Commeni tors take the sense to be, 'having ordained the elders by the votes of the people. But nearly : the most learned Interpreters have rejected tr interpretation, which requires a very straib sense to be put on Xecoorov., and one, moreo which is forbidden by the airous follow Hence it has been long exploded, and there no point on which the learned have been mi agreed for above a century, than this, that X0 here simply denotes 'having relected, constitu: appointed. See Hamm., Whitby, Wolf, : especially Kuin. At the same time it is gran: by some able maintainers of this interpreta 1 that the appointment in question is not the : thing with the formal Ecclesiastical ordinia of a somewhat later period. And, on the ol hand, the Presbyterians themselves admit imposition of hands accompanied this $x<c \rho o t-$ But if it did not amount (of which, howt I am not sure) to the solemn ordination later period, there is the leas reason to supp (as many do,) that the consent of the people previously obtained for these appointme Though indeed the imposition of harads. Wboth parties admit, taken in conjunction the solemn fasting and prayer, which ace panied the appointment, seem to show th, was, in fact, Ecclesiastical ordination; whil the same time, it seems probable that the Si tion of these Elders differed not a little from stated Pastors of a somewhat later age, w believers were divided into the two sep classes of Clergy, and Laity. At the pe now in question, the Presbyters probably cised their ministry in conjunction with trades or professions to which they had brought up. But when, in the next genera it had been thought expedient that Presb, should be confined to their sacred duties,
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secluded from all secular occupations，（which， by the way，made the two classes of Clergy and Laity）then ordination would become a much more solemn affair，and the conferring of it not be committed to any but to the highest rulers of the Church，who succeeded to the duties of the A postles．
 prayer under fasting，＇indicto jejunio．See Note on xiii． 3.
－xapé $\theta$ evto тē к．］＇committed them to the Divine keeping and protection．＇So in a kindred passage at xx ．32．тарaтiӨemat ímās
 See also 1 Pet．iv． 19.
 nymous with тapari $\theta \in \sigma \theta$ ac supra v． 23 ．But though the general sense of the passage is clear， yet with soey the Commentators are not a little perplexed．And those mighty Grecians Hem－ sterh．and Valckn．thought the difficulty 80 great as to warrant Critical conjecture．They would read，for †jav，户̄ecav，＇whence they had gone．＇ But the MSS．afford no countenance ；the Greek is questionable；and the form is not used in the N．T．The common reading must be retained， and explained as it may．Now the best Com－ mentators are agreed，that it is to be taken for örou ；referring for examples to Matt．xxv． $24 \&$ 26．Erod．xxx．36．This，however，explains no－ thing，and is，in fact，a mere cloak for ignorance． The only true view seems to be that of recog－ nising here a significatio pregnans，arising from a blending of two expressions，q．d．whence they had been commended \＆c．and from whence they had gone commended \＆c．，i．e．where，on their departing，they bad been commended．We might，therefore，translate，＇whence they had set out，commended＇\＆cc．＇BTגrpway is well rendered by Newc．and Wakef．‘had fulfilled，or performed．＇When the Aorist is put for the Imperf．，it is generally to be understood of action recently past，and is mostly used in nar－ ration．
27．Mer＇aitcivy The Commentators are not agreed whether the sense is＇by their means，＇ i．e．instrumentality；or，＇to them：＇for airois． The latter mode of interpretation is adopted by
the best Commentators，and is confirmed by several passages of the O．T．；but the former seems more agreeable to what follows．This may，however，have been a popular idiom com－ prehending both those senses．

XV．On the then situation of the Church at Jerusalem，and on the circumstances which led to the celebrated Apostolical decision of the question respecting the use of circumcision and the other forms of the Mosaic Law，as also on the nature and extent of that decree，see a full discussion in Recens．Synop．

1．tives］These are thought to have been Antiochians，and Jewish converts，who had formerly been Pharisees，and still retained an attachment to the forms of the Mosaic Law．At difidaoxov toivs dide入фois must be understood入е́ $\mathbf{\gamma}$ оутеs．
－тeptr．］Circumcision is put for the whole of the ritual law of Moses，as being the principal ceremony，binding the person who underwent it to the observance of the rest．＂B0ct，＇institution or precept ；＇a signification frequent in St．Luke＇s writings，but found no where else in the N．T．
2．ordacess］Bp．Pearce thinks，that as the word，being used of the Apostles，cannot mean tumult，or sedition，and discention would be improper，it should be rendered＇a standing up．＇ A more ill－founded criticism than which can scarcely be imagined．There is no resen why it should not be rendered discention，or dispute， of which sense the Commentators adduce two or three examples，as AIian V．H．ii．34．cited by

 would add a most apposite one from Fechyl．
 $y^{\prime}$ oux ivi $\sigma$ тáनts．If this should still be thought unsuitable to Apostles，we may place a comma after yevomivys，and understand the words of the brethren at large before mentioned； which is confirmed by $x$ xiii．10．тo $\lambda \lambda$ îs $\delta d$ yevo－ мévns $\sigma$ тdбeess，к．т．$\lambda$ ．
－ou乌ŋriocess］＇mutual discussion，＇or con－ troversy．Wets．，Matth．，Knapp，Griesb．，and Vater edit Yrría．，from several MSS．and some Versions，and the Ed．Princ．；but without rea－ son．The evidence of the Versions lies the con－
















tracy way. Nothing is more common than for compounds to be changed by the scribes into simples. Besides, $\zeta_{\eta \tau}$. would here be a term not strong enough. $\Sigma \nu \zeta \eta \tau$. is required, which occurs at v.7., whence the Editors in question affirm the present reading to have been altered. But that is quite a gratuitous supposition. "ETa$\xi a y$, scil. oi doc $\lambda \phi o l$, the brethren at large, not the Propositi ecclesia, as Hamm. supposes.
3. $\pi \rho o \pi \epsilon \mu \phi \theta \in ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s]$ This is by some rendered ' pramissi, commissioned, delegated;' which may be the sense. But it is explained by the best Commentators honorificè deducti, 'set forward on their way;' a mark of respect usually remdered to eminent persons among the antients, and always shown to Apostles, and of which we have mention further on in this Book and in the Epistles. Thus the of must be put for the pronoun demonstr., and consequently the punctuation should be that which I have adopted. See, however, xi. 11, compared with xiii. 4. \& vars. leet. 'Eлıनтрофпो้, ' conversion.' Formed on the use of $\dot{\pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \sigma \tau \rho \in \dot{\phi} \phi \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ at xi. 21. \& xiv. 15. 'Eォoiouv Xapà $\mu \epsilon \gamma$., 'occasioned great joy.' So Aristid. cited by Wets. : do ot $\Theta \in o ̀ s$

4. $\boldsymbol{a} \pi \epsilon \delta \epsilon ́ \chi \theta \eta \sigma a \nu]$ Not received, as E. V., but ' received with approbation,' as at xviii. 27.
 words are 80 manifestly St. Luke's that plain readers would be surprised to learn that any other opinion had ever been formed. And yet many eminent Commentators, stumbling at what they think the harshness of the answer, or decision, being given before the question, or difficulty, had been propounded, suppose the words to be those of the Jewish party at Antioch reported by Paul and Barnabas. But although a transition from the oblique is occasionally found, (as in i. 4. xvii. 8. and Lu.v. 14.) yet here it would be

 will not be a suitable term. In fact, the diffcully is quite imaginary; for as the words avior-

Yet $\lambda a \nu-a \dot{u} \tau \infty \quad$ cannot but signify that ${ }^{j}$ an account of what had happened to the: exercise of their mission, the difficult brought them there could not fail to i toned. See Kin., who refers to a brevity at Acts xi. 3. On this view, all vanishes, and $\epsilon$ gavéornoav has peru priety, and the $\dot{\epsilon} \mathcal{G}, \delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ may be render. there started up;' not ' rose up,' aversions. The word is often used in Xenoph., and the best writers. in the start forth from ambush, by which w: suddenness. Now that is very applica present passage. It should seem th. dazing party, on hearing the matter $p$ suddenly and hastily started up, sa? was proper to \&c. This opinion, it it given not at a public assembly, cal purpose of considering the matter i but probably at one held publicly to $r$ on their return. The meeting dent $\chi^{0} \eta \sigma a \nu$ was plainly another, called pose of deciding on the question at beration. IIexiateucótes is Partic stantive, and must be taken all determining the sense. The wort Moǘćcos are, I think, not in or us but indirecta, as they are taken in version, and that of Dodder., con 1 Syr. Peshito.
6. [ঠeĩ тepl] This, by an idiot in Hebrew, Greek, and English, consider about.' See Cant. vi. 11.
 are not agreed on the sense of tl Several of them take it to meal - from the beginning of the Gospel be observed, that the purpose in not made known till the conversion for that is plainly alluded to in The expression will appear to be $r$ to that period, ( 13 or 14 years bef sider that $\alpha^{\prime} \rho$ रaĩos is, as De Dieu shown, used of what has happe
whether many ages before, or only a few years; of which examples are adduced. Thus our common version 'a good while ago' very well represents the sense.
 with which the Commentators are much perplexed. It is, however, pretty much agreed among the learned, that the expression is to be regarded as a Hebraism, בחר in Hebrew taking after it $ב, d \nu$. And thus it will be equivalent to
 precarious; and this occurrence of $\dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{iv}$ and $\mu \mathrm{ov}$ in the same clause would be harsh. As to iv ทimiv, it is, after all, best rendered in our common version (confirmed by the Syr. and De Lieu) ' amongst us.' Then é $\mu \epsilon$ may be supplied, (as in the Syr. and Bohem. Versions) which is suppressed through delicacy, as in very many passages which I could adduce from Thucyd. The Apostle, after uttering the word $\dot{\varepsilon} \in \in \lambda$., does not
 might have done, but omits it, and gives the sentence another turn, so as to avoid egotism.
8. кардьoyvaioryc ] See Note on i. 24. By this the Apostle hints that God can best determine who are worthy of being admitted as Christans, and who not, as also the rites and ceremonies to be enjoined on them. 'Eんaprúpnger aurois. The sense (unperceived by the Interpreters) seems to be 'hath borne testimony in their favour,' ' hath testified his approbation,' namely, by giving them the Holy Spirit. MapTunics with a Dative also implies favourable testimony. This signification occurs in Lu. xi. 48. and often in the Classical writers.
9. oiờd dıéspove] ' male mo distinction.' A remarkable idiom, of which the Commentators adduce no apposite example. The following, however, which I have noted, will supply the deficiency. Thucyd. i. 49, 7. ठиексккрıто oud dr. Diod. Sinop. ap. Ashen. p. 239. out ${ }^{2}$ ora-
 sapotas are denoted not their minds, but their souls and consciences: there were sanctified by the Holy Spirit and purified by the great truths of the Gospel.
10. тесра́\} е т е ~ a d v ~ O c d ] ~ i . e . ~ ' ~ t r y ~ t h e ~ f o r - ~ bearance of God by perversely resisting his will.'
 ere. Hebr. iii. 9. and often in the O. T., as Exod. xvii. 2 \& 7. Ps. Ixxxviii. 46. This is the
interpretation of Schleps. Lex., and is, I think, the best founded. Others may be seen in Recens.

11. $d \lambda \lambda a \dot{\delta} \dot{\alpha}$-кג்кivot] There are few passages that, with the appearance of plainness, involve more difficulty than this. That indeed is apparent from the variety of senses assigned to the words by Commentators. And no wonder; since iris, though concealed in wtareviouev, and váкeivot are capable of being applied to different persons; and the ellip. at кincivoe may be filled up in two ways. The we is by some refared to the Apostles, Peter and James; by others to Peter only. But neither methods can be admitted. Thus also кáкeivot is referred by some to ob tarépes; by others, to Paul and Barnabas; both, 1 conceive, erroneously. It is, I think, plain that $u \in$ and those, which are antithetical, must denote no other than the same persons as aúrois (i.e. the Gentiles) and rimiv, similarly antithetical at v.8. and iras and aúräy at v.9., namely the Jewish and the Gentile converts. Again, there is, I apprehend, at da тй $\chi$ dip \&c. the very common clip. of mónov. See Lu. xvii. 10. At кáкeivos the true grammatical clip. would be rioreúours. But among the other peculiarities of the Hellenistic style is that of anomalous ellip., as here of $\sigma \oplus \theta$ jo orval. Finally, the $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha^{i}$ is adversative, answering an objection, and signifies imo, nay, yea, as in 2 Cor. vii. 11. Thus we may render : yea by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ alone do we trust we shall be saved-in which same way they too are alone to be saved.' The inference is obvious, and therefore left to be supplied, that a thing so unimportant to alvacion as the observation of the ceremonies of the Mosaic law ought not to be exacted from the Gentile converts. The true reference in us and they was alone perceived by Hamm., Whitby, Doddr., A. Clarke, and Scott. And this view is confirmed by Cicumenius. The sentiment here is the very same as that in Galas. in. $15 \& 16$. Rom. iii. 30.
12. $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta_{0}$ ] The word does not here signify multitude, but assembly, or symurd, (as Lu. xxiii. 1. and elsewhere) consisting of persons convened for the special purpose of considering this quesion. The passage might be freely rendered, "Whereupon the assembly at large kept a reverential silence, and listened to Paul and Barnabas
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while recounting' \&c. That was done for the purpose of establishing the facts on which the validity of Peter's reasoning rested.
13. © © $\left.\in \kappa \rho i \theta_{\eta}\right]$ 'addressed [the assembly].'
14. кäcis] for wis, how. Il piton is not well rendered at the first, because that might seem to mean at the beginning of the Gospel. See Note on v. 7. Doddr. and Newt. well translate 'first.' 'Eтeonéqato $\lambda a \beta$ eî̀ \&c. A blending of two

 see Note on Lu. i. 68. 'Ell Tap" $\delta \nu$. a., 'in order to bear his name and be called his peculiar people, by professing his Religion.

16-17. This quotation is taken from the LXX., with the following unimportant variatons. Meta taûta is for èv тй ग̀mépa èкeivp, to give the sense more clearly; and Rosenm. says " rectè vertit." 'Avaorpéqco is supplied, though without any thing corresponding to it in the Hebrew, for the same cause. The next clause is compressed by blending the two parts of a
 pac tout alayos are omitted; and with reason, since they make no sense. The Translators ought to have seen that there is an clips. of 1 at כימימ עילסם (occurring in Mich. vii. 14. and Is. lvii. 9.) may have been considered as a sort of adverb. Finally, the words $\tau d y$ кúptov are not found in the LXX., at least in the principal text, the Vatican. But there is no real discrepancy, since it is imposesidle to suppose the above to be correct, the sense being left so miserably incomplete. The Alexandrian text supplies rove кúpicy; and that is adopted by Abp. Newt., as representing the true reading of the Hebrew text. But rashly; for there can be little doubt that it is from the margin. And the conjecture of the learned
 ingenious, must be pronounced unfounded, and is negatived by $\tau \delta \nu$ кúpiov not being brought in after dxYnt. I have no doubt that the reading of the Aldine and Pachom, and perhaps several other copies of the Sept., represents the true text, viz. \&к乡ทrnowiol $\mu$ e. The $\mu$ was changed into an $\mu$, and the absorbed in os. The Td $\nu$ кúpiov of St. James was a gloss on the $\mu \varepsilon$, and perhaps had at an early period expelled the textual reading in some MSS. At any rate it was adopted by St. James, as making the sense yet
clearer. Still between the Sept., e; emended, and the Hebrew there is an variation. Correspondent to ores is
 'that they may possess the residue But that makes such bad sense, eve that Rosenm. has done with it, that be no doubt that the Hebrew text And this suspicion is countenanced treme, and, for the Hebrew text, al: cedented vars. lect., none of then giving any aid. The corruption older than the Masoretic recension. reading is certainly what Light. : Nw read שTK.
But, to turn from words to this true that the Apostle accommodate to the propagation of the Gospe Gentiles. The Prophet himself. doubt, so meant it, at least if he bended the sense of the prediction to make. Nay, even the sep (Junior) remarks: "Que hic $F$ multo suns ampliora et magniface. Hiskiz tempore, ant post reditun exilio, ant Hyrcani tempore, possunt."

- oкฑviv] The word props booth or hut ; but sometimes dens house, and figuratively a fame applied to a royal family, its re Katarkdxto properly signifies was often used of the utter destr or cities. See Dr. Blomf. on AE who (as does also Kypke) ad amples, though not one that present use. The following maacceptable. ※lian V.H. xii. $\mu$ évฑ.
 at Rom. iii. 1. Heb. ㅈi. 6. signi tin of the Hebr. or : earnestly seek, for the purpo: and serving him. The catalo $\pi$ con is explained by the ra clause. In $d \pi$ a aurous there is

18. yvootai-autov ] The Commentators appeared so mi the introduction of this rems much to be supplied to unit




chain of reasoning with the preceding. To remedy which, novelties of interpretation are proposed by some ; and others would cut out
 aiūvos with the preceding. But there is very little authority for the former course; and the Latter is negatived by both the Helsew and Sept. Beside, surpusing them away, then sumething is wanting, and yet something which would never have been thus supplied. In fact, the vente reems necessary us a link in the chain of reasoning, and though introduced abruptly, yet it is in a manner very agreeable to the Hellenistic and Scriptural style, which deals much in such axiomatical sentences. Chrys., as 1 have proved in Recens. Synop., certainily read the words; and the sense they are meant to convey seems to be this: God is immutable. He hath determined from all eternity (so that the thing is not a novelty) to found a spiritual kingdom into which not only Jeus, but Gentiles, shall be received. Thus the scope of the verse is to engraft on the correspondence of the conversion of the Gentiles. with antient prophecies, a reflection on the prescience and providence of God.
19. iza spirme], 'My judgment or opinion [on the matter] is.' That this is the sense the beest literpreters antient and modern are agreed. Wets. aptly cites Thucyd. iv. 60 . ©is di $\gamma$ o s sinvo. and Grot. the Latin fta censeo. It should be observed, that the term кpivooimplies decided opinion. M, $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, mapevox入eiv. 'to give them no molestation.' The atapa does not, as many fancy, import ' unnecessurily,' but coalesses with the iy and $\dot{x} \lambda$ I., to make up the sense. It seems to be a popular form of expression, and the only apposite example cited by the Commentators is Arrian. Epict. i. 9. Mnde пapevo-
 Hebr. xii. 15.
20. $\langle\pi$ roreìat aivois] 'to direct them by letter,' as Acts xxi. 25. Toü dxixerotat. The Genit. seems to be dependent on Everca understood, equivalent to iva d $d \pi e x$ wivat. But to advert to the particulars of the prohibition
 quite Hellenstic, and is derived from $d \lambda i \sigma \gamma e l v$, to pollute. How that signification aries the lexicographers do not tell us. Perhaps it may be derived from $d \lambda i{ }^{2} \omega$ and $d \lambda i \infty$, to roll, which in a neuter sense will mean to roll oneself, i.e. to uallurx. And then, by an easy transition, (perhaps by a metaphor borrowed from surine, see 2 Pet. ii. 22.) it may denote to suffer pollution. And both it and the noun are used alike of physical and moral defilement, especially that of idolatry, as the greatest. See Dan. i. 8 . Ecclus. x1. 39. Mal. vil. 2., where the subject is meat offered to idols. Here, however. to fully
 addel. Now though the word might denote any participation in idolatry, yet the passages of Danie I and Malachi, which were probably in the mind of the Apootle, as well as the antient gloses
of Hesych. and Suid., (formed, no doubt, from the early Scholiasts, ) determine it to be the eating of meats offered to idols, not merely in the temples, but even when it was taken for sale into the public market. For, we learn from the passages cited by the Commentutors, that among the Gentiles, after the sacrifice of a victim in the temple, and when a portion had been given to the priests, and sometimes another eaten by the offerer and his friends on the spot, the residue was often taken home for domestic use, and sometimes was sent to the public shambles to be sold. The flesh, however, was, of course, held in abomination by the Jews, (See I Cor. x.20.) and therefore the use of it was very properly forbidden, in order that no needless offence might be given to the Jewish Christians.

- xal tīs topueias] Most Commentators are much at a loss to account for this being inserted among things of themselves lawful, but from which the Gientiles were to abstain, lest they should offend the Jewish Christians. For ropveía, they olserve, was never accounted as a thing permitted; and no reason would appear why, if greater offences are mentioned with smaller ones, this alone should be taken; which, they think, would go far to put the things mentioned in this list on a level. To remove this difficulty, many methods have been derised. Bentley conjectures xoipcias, pork. But that is utterly unauthorized. Others propose various interpretations. Some understand spiritual uhoredom, viz. idolatry. Others, marriage uith idolaters. Others, again, meat sold in the public shops. Fach of these interpretations is open to insuperable objections, stated in Recens. Synop., and particularly this, which is applicable to them all. that no recondite or uncommon sense could be intended; since in public edicts words are supposed to be used in their usual sense. In fact, there is no good reason to alrandon the common version fornication, which has been defended by the ablest Commentators, as Grot., Wets., Valckn., Schoettg., Pearce, Nitzch, Rosenm., Kuin., Scott, Wahi, and Hp. Marsh, which last writer satisfactorily remores the objections to the word being taken in its ordinary sense, showing that there are other instances to be found of moral and positive precepts, duties of common and perpetual obligation with local and temporary ones, in the same list, as in the Decalogue. And he concludes by saying. "that since it appears from the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of Paul, that the precepts of the Pentateuch were abrogated only by degrees, it seems by no means extraordinary that the Decree of the Council in Jerusalem should contain a mixture of moral and positive commands." I would add, that it is not unimportant, in this view, to remark that in the words of the decision actually sent ( $\mathbf{v} .29$.) we find the tun kept separate, ropveiar being put apart from the rest, and list. It is also very well suggested by Nitzch, that "' a distinction
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should be made between the Scholastic and the popular mode of instruction，the latter of which respects practice，and is propounded for certain persis，in certain cases，and for a certain end； and must therefore conjoin all points that pertain to that end，whether they be local，or common．＂ As to the objection founded on mopveia being never dósídooov，it might not in theory，or philo－ sophical speculation，but was so considered practically．No one who is at all acquainted with the Classical writers can doubt that simple fornication was，by the Heathens，considered as no crime at all．We find that even their eli－ goon permitted，nay encouraged，licensed forni－ cation．It is unnecessary for me to defile my pages with the gross details which some Com－ mentators offer，or writers on Classical antiquities will supply．Therefore，it is certain．that the recommendation of chastity of this kind（for that contained in abstaining from adultery，could not need enforcing）was highly necessary，and there was the more occasion to give the injunction， since，for many reasons，which are detailed in Recens．Synop．，whoredom and idolatry were in the minds of the Jews inseparably connected， （Compare 1 Cor．x． $7 \& 8$. v．11．Eph．v．5．Col． iii． 5 ．Revel．ii． 14 \＆20．）and particularly since whoredom was especially committed at the heathen temples，and licensed by the idolatrous priests．See particularly Exod．xxxiv．14－16． To abstain from this，therefore，was alike neces－ gary to maintain their credit both with the Jewish Christians，and with the heathens whom they had left．It has been justly observed by Grot．， that the sole purpose of this list was to specify from what things besides known sins the Gentile Christians ought to abstain，in order to coalesce with the Jewish Christians without offence．
 Athen．L．ix．）namely，flesh of animals killed by strangling，which was much in use（especially in the smaller animals，and in fowls，for reasons of epicurism）by the antients，both Greeks， Romans，and Orientals．As to the blond，the heathen nations used，when butchering an animal， to carefully preserve the blood，and mixing it up with flour and unguents，made various sorts of dishes．Now as both the foregoing were strictly forbidden in the Mosaic law，there was ample reason to forbid them to the Gentile Christians， in order to avoid giving offence to the Jewish brethren．That an injunction of so local and of such temporary obligation cannot be binding on

Christians of these times，is manif－ been convincingly established by S Doddr，whom see in Recent．Synop．
21．M $\omega \sigma \hat{j} \mathrm{~s} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \rho$ \＆c．］Here aga： been imagined to be such abrupter：－ ion，and want of connexion between and the preceding that many ha something to have been lost out of it the connexion，though obscure，mil See several modes detailed in Rec all of them more or less objection： score of requiring too much to which to refer the $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ．I would the following as the simplest mode connexion：＂［And remember， these will occasion not only priv scandal，］for the Mosaic religion long period backward，had its pro city，and its Scriptures public l： synagogues every sabbath－day．
 syntax in éк入e $\xi a \mu$ évous is genera quite agreeable to the proprict rpáчayтes deviates entirely $i$ ought，it is said，to have been wi
 $\mu$ évous，however，is as regular a and is more frequent in the later sephus）the Accusative being $u$ finit．as in Latin．Yet it is not Kypke and Rosenm．think）for $\pi \in \mu \psi \omega \sigma t$, but is a different which the Ascus．is closely a－： Infin．，and $\tau \delta$ is understood． explain what was meant by $t$ seemed good．＂As to rpátar that is merely an anacoluthon sentences，especially contain clauses，is not unusual．So Th тої－dжюкалойдтєs．iv．42．то d $\rho \bar{\omega} \nu \tau e s$. and often；in which c in the Nomin．is used as if a person plur．indic，had precede pévous，literally＇leading me idiom by which the Particix adjective or substantive． adduce no apt example．It or cipial form with an Article， Lu．xxii．26．＂Ed oE is the decrees usually commenced．
23．रaipell Sub．入éyoug： idiom frequently occurs in the is said by the minor Greek















have originated with Cleon the demagogue，who prefixed it in the place of eu xpáagety to his distich announcing the victory at Pylum．Yet is was used a very short time after by one not likely to have imitated Cleon，namely Xenophon． Cur．iv．Kūpos Kuakípet Xaipetr．and soon after by Plato in his third Epistle to Dionysius． In the Horatian＂Celso gaudere et beni rem gerere refer＂there is allusion to both forms．
24．¿q́a pa $\alpha_{a \nu}$ See Note on Matt．ii．3．and Gal．i．7．which latter is a kindred passage．＇Ava－ oxevi\}̧ovess. 'Avack. properly signifies to pack any thing up for removal；as in Thucyd．i． 18. and elsewhere ；2．to remove，as in Xenoph．An． vi．2，5；3dly．from this packing up and removal easily arises the sense of sacking，carrying off， plundering，which，though weakly proved by the Commentators，may be established from
 е்лт
 term signifies＇carried off as plunder．＇I am therefore inclined to think the sense here may be，＇removing and perverting your minds from the truth．＇Aéyoypes neper．，＇telling you to be circumcised．＇Aé $\mathbf{y}$ es，like cimeiv，has of ten the sense of commanding，which is here adopted by the Commentators．But it does not， 1 conceive． in the present case come up to that．Oils oi dicot．Sub．oudev，＇to whom we gave no direc－ ton or authority［so to act］．＇＇The ouvoty is necessary to be supplied，because oi dca⿱亠乂⿱一土丷亍． almost always signifies to forbid．
 which is expressed elsewhere in this Book．
 pended their lives，＇by a slight hyperbole；not delivered up，i．e．Laid down，as Wakef．renders． ＇ T rip $\boldsymbol{\tau o u}$
27．kail airoves ba $\lambda$ óyou d $\pi a \gamma \gamma$ ．Tam ait á’ I have on Thucyd．vii．8．\＆10．（Transl．）treated on the subject of messengers，or the bearers of public letters or despatches，being allowed to explain any obscurity therein．The truth is that such were，in the earlier ages，always sent，in the form of verbal messages，by trusty persons
to deliver by word of mouth；and that had continued even up to the age of Thucyd．On the introduction，however，of written messages． or despatches，still the custom was retained of permitting the messenger to explain any ob－ scurity in the Epistle，or give further particulars of what was only briefly adverted to in the letter ； nay occasionally to act as a sort of ambassador． and treat on the business at issue．Sometimes， however，the messengers were forbidden to say any thing；and therefore the words cal aurous doa 入ójou \＆c．here，may be considered as in－ forming the persons addressed，that the mes－ sengers were empowered to deliver the same mes－ sage by word of mouth，of course more fully and explicitly，if desired．＇Amayyèlogras．Pres．for Fut．：or render＇who are to tell you by message．＇

28．cob ge raj 〕 I know not why all the， English Translators should render the $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$＇for．＇ It is plainly resumptive，and put for ouv，as often， in the Sept．＂Evoke，＇it hath seemed good．＇
 who are deciding under the influence of the Holy Spirit．＇Bג́pos．It was an early，and especially Oriental form of expression to apply the terms Bápos，Yuyds \＆cc．to all laws，orders \＆c．laid on those subject to their authority，whether they were heavy or light．See Revel．ii．4．and Matt． xxiii．4．and Note．At dтdyayкes many ami－ neat Commentators stumble，and they propose various conjectures，all unnecessary．＇End－ vaүкes comes from the old adjective grand $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{j} \boldsymbol{s}$ ， which is found only in the Nomin．or Accus． neuter．It is properly an adverb，and is found in the best writers from Herodot．downwards．Here it is put for an adjective，by the ellip．of 3 oren． Or Tiny draduayces may be considered as stand－ ing for ä́ éxáva sykes жoเทriov．

29．ai xpákere］This does not merely mean． ＇you will do right，＇as many Commentators suppose，but，＇it shall be happy for you，＇＇it will tend to your salvation．＇I would compare Eccles．viii．12．Is．iii．10．Jerem．Iii． 6.
30．גंगо入voíveres］having been dismiseed，＇ as v．33．＇Eォédockay tiv ix．，A vex sol．de hae re．See Wets．
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 why so many eminent Commentators should have interpreted $\pi a \rho a \kappa \lambda \eta^{\prime} \sigma e c t e x h o r t a t i o n$, or instruc－ tion．The common interpretation，（confirmed by all the antient Yersions）consolation or com－ fort，is more suitable and natural．They rejoiced at the comfort which this Epistle gave them，by the assurance that they were delivered from whatever was burdensome in the Mosaic Law． This use of the Article，as referring to some－ thing which may very well be supplied from the context or the subject matter，is rather un－ common．

32．трофйтat］See xi．27．and Note，as also Bp．Pearce in Recens．Synop．Dià $\lambda$ óyou тол入ō̈，＇in a discourse of considerable length．＇ Пapeкd入．，＇exhorted，admonished，and instructed them；＇stating，we may suppose，the grounds and reasons on which the determination of the Synod was founded，by showing why the whole ritual was not enjoined，and why a part was re－ tained；and withal defining the cause，nature， and extent of the duty of abstaining，in certain cases，from things naturally lawful．
33．тorijoayres xpóvov＇having staid some time．＇An idiom confined to the later and espe－ cially the Hellenistic writers．Mer＇elprivns， i．e．with good wishes and prayers for their welfare，or whatever was included in the Hebr． whe，See Note on Joh．xiv． 17.
34．e $\delta o \xi \in$－aùo $\bar{u}]$ This verse is omitted in several Miss．and Versions，and is rejected by Mill，Wets．，Pearce，Newc．，Kuin，and Griesb：， bracketed by Vat．，and cancelled by Matthri． The reason which they assign for its having come to be inserted，is，that it was done to account for what might have seemed strange and inconsistent in Silas being said to have gone with Jude to Jerusalem，whereas，a few days after，he is said to have been chosen by Paul as his companion in his journey to visit the churches．Yet（say the critics in question）＂he may have gone to Jeru－ salem，and been sent for from thence，and the circumstance of his sending for，been omitted to be mentioned．＂I must own that there is nothing to negative this in the expreesion $\mu e \tau \dot{a} \tau$ tvas
 tion of a plan which might not be carried into executiom for some short time）that being an
indefinite term，which may，at least，me not a very few days．See xvi．13．I however，something very hypothetical in of accounting for the insertion．In－ insertions for such a purpose are ver： none but Critics would do it．On hand，if we suppose the verse to be omission may readily be accounted for， remove a seeming inconsistency，a p－ here said to have staid，who was ju：－ to have gone ；in which case the re and that on a level with the capacit： scribes，would be to cancel the verse． and Commentators have felt the sar and resorted to the same mode of Whereas it may satisfactorily be taking $\alpha \pi e \lambda \dot{u} \theta$ ．not in the sense def the usual one dimissi sunt，as in Schl．We may freely render，‘’ their dismission（or permission，）in going．＇At xpos roves dix．we ma léval．This is confirmed by the －dimiserunt eos fratres in pace One might，indeed，have expected have been added that Jude went， But this was not absolutely nece－ omissions are frequent．Words to indeed，found in some MSS．ani it is so very difficult to account fo and so easy for their insertion（fr that they cannot be received． that Silas＇s first determination sudden，and only at the very per Thus internal evidence is decid． the genuineness of the verse；a dence is equally as much so． the MSS．and those mostly alt． omit it．The Versions are fe， the citations from Chrys．and the purpose．I see no proof Theophyl．did not read the ver： ever，in deference to the opinion Critics，placed the verse in sing
 ot］This may be a common $G$ тws èxougt ol díe入 фof́．Or may supply бке廿о́мешоs．fron exivk．must here denote insper as Christian professors．Henc























use of the term driбкотоs in the sense Bishop, which not long afterwards arose.
 (which signifies, wished or thought proper) must be closely united with $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \pi a \rho a \lambda a \beta e i v$, as in several passages of Thucyd. cited in Recess. Synop.

XV1. 1. кarpurnare] Literally " went down to.' A sense often occurring in this Book, and found in the later Greek writers.

- iv v inc] Whether this is to be understood of Derbe, or Lystra, Commentators are not agreed. The present passage favours the opinion that he was of Lystra; while that at $\times x .4$. is thought by some to prove him to have been of Derbe.
 Gaius only, otherwise St. Luke would have written sal 「áios cal Tıцóveos, $\Delta$ epßaĩot. He does not to TimóӨeor add Augtpaios, because it was unnecessary, he having, he thought, expressed that here. And certainly the dкcí cannot well be understood of any other than Lystra, since that was the last mentioned place. From the position of the cities there can be no doubt that they went to Derbe first, and then to Lystra.

3. терเе́тєнєу a.] He bad not been circumcised, because his mother had no right to do that without the father's consent. The reason why Paul circumcised him (which he might do without violation of Christian liberty, as being of . Jewish birth, and because, though circumcision
was not enjoined as necessary to the Gentile conversts, it might be sometimes expedient) is just after suggested, namely, that he might not offend the Jews, who would conclude Timothy to be uncircumcised because his father was a Gentile, and, consequently, would not listen to his teaching; therefore the Apostle accommodated himself to the prejudices of weak brethren. On the contray, he did not permit Titus, who was of Gentile birth by both parents, to be circumcised, because it was demanded to be done by the false teachers, as necessary to salvation. There St. Paul could not give way. See more in Grot. and Doddr.
4. жapedidouv aüroīs фu入. \&c.] ' commanded to them observances.'
5. 'A ${ }^{\prime}[a]$ This must here denote that part of Asia Minor which was peculiarly so called, i.e. Ionia, or the region of which Ephesus was the capital. How this hindrance was imparted to them, whether by dream, or by some mental hmpression is uncertain. The latter is most proGable, and the Apostles well knew how to distinguish the motions of the Holy Spirit from their own thoughts.
6. туeїца ] Nine MSS. add 'I $\eta \sigma o u ̄$, and others, with several Versions and some Fathers, tout 'I $\eta \sigma o v i$, which is adopted by Mill and Wets., and received into the text by Griesb., Knapp, Titty., and Vat., as had been long ago done by Beza: And it is expressed by Doddr., Newt., and Wakef. But there seems no sufficient evidence
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of its genuineness to warrant its reception. The external evidence is weak, as far as regards MSS.; and Versions and Fathers are, in a matter of this kind, not quite unexceptionable testimony. But, to advert to internal evidence, it would at first sight seem that as $\pi \nu \in \bar{u} \mu a$ ' $I \eta \sigma o \bar{u}$ is a very rare expression, occurring no where else, but in Phil. i. 19. (and there in a different sense) we may far better account for the omission than for the insertion of 'I $\eta \sigma o \bar{u}$. And yet we do not elsewhere find that rare expressions are cancelled by the scribes. Besides, when any very rare forms of expression are connected with important doctrinal questions, we are to advert to the possibility, nay probability, that they may have been tampered with by the antient Theologians, either by adding something to the text, or by removing something from it. In fact, it appears from the Note of Wets. that the Romanists, a little after the printing of the Greek Text, maintained that 'Inooù had been expunged by the Nestorians; which is incredible. They might rather have been expected to add than to remove it. The addition, however, 1 suspect, came from the Arians, who would have more reason to add it, in order to destroy so decided an example of тd $\pi \nu e \bar{u} \mu a$ in the personal sense. Thus it is caught up by all the Socinian interpreters. See Wakef. And when once introduced by the Arians, it would be likely to be admitted by the Nestorians, who would rather have it than not. From the former of these it was, I suspect, foisted into the Vulgate, and by the latter into the Syriac Version, and from thence it would easily be transmitted to the Ethiopic, Coptic, and Armenian Versions. Finally, the word is strongly discountenanced by the context. For, to use the words of Bp . Middl., " in the preceding verse we are told that the Apostles were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia; in the present, that on their attempting to go into Bithynia, the Spirit suffered them not. It is, therefore, highly unnatural that the $\tau \dot{\delta} \pi \nu \in \bar{u} \mu \alpha$ of the latter verse should be meant of any other than the $\tau \boldsymbol{d} \ddot{\alpha} \gamma$ tov $\pi \nu e \bar{u} \mu a$ of the former.
 after having before all along used they, it is plain that he himself became a companion of Paul and Timothy in this journey.
7. $\sigma v \mu \beta$.\} collecting, conjecturing. See Not on ix. 22.
8. $\pi \rho$ airn- $\pi$ odıs] The Commentators ba: here found, or made many difficulties. Philin was not the capital of Macedonia, but The\% hmica; and $\pi \rho$ coirn cannot mean mest consit. able, opulent, \&c., (though there is reason think Philippi was so) but frrst in rank. To :t move this difficulty, many eminent Comere tators would read $\pi \rho$ coirns, in the sense, ' whes is 2 city of the Provincia prima of Macedon But thus the Article would be requisite, and circumstance little to the purpose be introducand, what is more, not a single MS. is found have the reading. חрcirn, then, must be retais: and taken either in the sense ' the first city;' if it were certain that Thessalonica then was capital of the province, ' a primary city;' wh: use of $\pi \rho \bar{\omega} \pi o s$ has been proved by Ecth. ferred to by Kuin. Bp. Middlet. prefers former mode ; and as $\mu$ epidor undoubtedly mez district, he would render : ' which is the chit its district, a city of Macedonia, a colony.' Th: however, is doing great violence to the constr:tion ; for the $\pi \rho \dot{\sin } \boldsymbol{\eta} \eta$ must be canstrued w. módis. But if so, and $\pi \rho$ córns cannot be al mitted, and if $\mu$ peidos mean, as it must do, $F$ vince, the $\bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ before $\mu$ epidos will be worse th. useless, and should be omitted, as it is in som Versions and Fathers. The tins before Maa. omitted in several MSS., but it is probail genuine. It should seem that St. Luke wrei only one $\tau \bar{j}$ s and that before Max., but that $t!$ scribes in general, mistakingly, put it befil $\mu \in \rho$., which they ignorantly took to mean countas, I suspect, the Syriac Translator did. Or : т $\bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ may, in some instances, have arisen from var. lect. of $\pi \rho \omega \dot{o} \boldsymbol{\eta}$, namely $\pi \rho \sigma \dot{\tau} \eta \mathrm{s}$.
9. тара потаді̀ ${ }^{2}$ ' by the river-side ;' $r$, 'by a river,' as our English Translators rendt for the Strymon, which is the only river, must meant. And the Article is omitted chiefly : account of the notoriety of the river, and par: by reason of a preposition being used. Middl.
 mentators are not agreed on the sense of thi words, which the earlier ones take to me: where prayer was wont to be made; while it









later ones interpret, ' where, according to the Jewish custom, there was a proseuche, or oratory.' That such places (not edifices, but groves, like the antient Druidical temples) were then frequent, where no synagogue was to be found, is proved by the Commentators; as also that such were held by the sea or river side. Yet 1 see not how oi èvoцiदєтo eivas can have the above sense, still less be taken for ou $\dot{\eta} \nu$, with others. Neither do 1 see any truth in the objections, that the common interpretation yields too indefinite a sense, and is unauthorized phraseology. The former seems not to have a shadow of reason; and the latter is overturned by one of the pas: sages adduced to extablish the new interpretation,
 xutivees ixi tous minoion aiyialois, tas
 elval. where we have the very phrase, and in the very sense of the common interpretation. It is plain that St. Luke bere does not employ the term mooreux $\eta$, however it may have been in use, but adopted a circumlocution for greater perspicuity. It is true, that at v. 16. тореvopercos
 be taken in the sense prosencha, as is admitted even by some who contend for the common interpretation. But though I am not prepared to assert that the sence in that passage ' as we were going to prayer' is to be justitied, since that would make the notice of the time when the circumstance took place still more indeterminate, and be very frigid: yet the sense proseucha would require the Article. It should seem that the sense there is something between proseucha and prayer, namely prayer-meeting, q. d. as we were going to the place where prayer was wont to be made.

- iגa入oürev] Not 'discoursed with,' as Wakef. rencters; for $\lambda$ aleiv must here be taken in the sense of harangue, or discuurse as a public teacher or preacher; as is plain from the preceding кa*ioavres, which alludes to the posture adopted. Tais ouve入 $\theta$. ruvackt. Hence it is plain that the congregation consisted of women only. To account for which, we may suppose that since that separation of the sexes, which always subsisted in regular buildings, such as synagogues, was impossible in places like proseuche, the same end was effected by the sexes attending at different timea.

14. Avoía] Some take this as a name of country, and to be joined with yuvir. But the סyónatt shows it to be a proper name. The name was common both among the Gireeks and Romans. Порфטрóт $\omega \lambda \iota s$, i.e. 2 seller not of
purple dye, but of purple rests, for which the Lydians were famous, who seem to have participated in, or succeeded to the reputation of the Tyrians.
 probably derived from the Hebrew, for it occurs in the Jewish prayers, as also in 2 Macc. i. 14.
 $\pi \rho o \sigma т d \gamma \mu a \sigma 1$. Themist. 2. p. 29. and other writers. The mind is said to be closed against admonition, which, either, from prejudice, cannot know the truth, or, from pride and perversity. will not admit the admonition. Hence to open the mind or beart denotes, to render it more intelligent, to cause that any one shall better perceive the truth, and more readily yield assent to it. The opening in question was effected by the grace of God working with the concurrent good dispositions of Lydia.
 the Lord [and his religion].' The expression elsewhere occurs without the addition of $\tau \bar{\omega} \kappa$., and denotes a Christian. IIapepiagato $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \bar{\alpha}$ s. This term, like diva $\gamma \times \dot{\prime}\}_{\infty}$, is used of the moral compulsion of urgent entreaty, such as, in a manner, compels the penson to grant the request. St. Luke here, and in his Gospel xxiv. 29., seems to have had in mind Gen. xix. 3. where Lot, it is said, кaтєßiǎ̧eтo (many good MSS. have тapeß., which is probably the true reading) the angel to enter; also 1 Kinge xxviii. 23. кal oúk
 aaī̀es каl $\dot{\eta}$ yuví. The $\pi$ apa signifies prater [scil. voluntatem.] and thus mapapiá\}ect is a
 Lu. xxiv. 29.
15. тatठiok ${ }^{\nu}$ ] 'a girl,' or, as appears from what follows, a female servant or slave.

- Exouaay пуєìma шúv.] For a full detail of the various opinions on this somewhat perplexing subject see Recens. Synop., Townsend's Dis. on the nature of the spirit of divination in the Pythoness. and Scott in loc. Suffice it here to remark, that xúderv is properly an appellation of Apollo. But, as he was the God of divination, it came to be applied to soothsayers, conjurers, and those who pretended to evoke spirits. Now as rentriloquism was a most useful art to persons of that profession, they generally acquired more or less of it; hence the word is sometimes so explained in the antient Greek lexicographens. Whether this girl was a ventriloquist, has treen much debated; but the negatice is the view adopted (and, I think, rightly) by the most eminent Commentators. See Deyling, Wolf, and Kuin. There is no reason to suppose it from the name, and
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still less from the circumstances．A more imp－ portant question is，whether she was an impostor， or a mere lunatic and insane person，who，like Joanna Southcote，fancied she was inspired to foretel future events．As to the former，Deyling， Wolf，Walch，and Biscoe have convincingly shown it to be unfounded；and the latter notion involves far greater difficulty than the common opinion，adopted by the antients and most mo－ den Commentators，that she was possessed by an evil spirit，which enabled her to foretel future events．Indeed，it is plain that St．Luke and St．Paul both viewed the matter in that light． The expression，then，is a kindred one with that used by St．Luke in his Gospel，iv．33．ar $\nu 0 \rho \omega \pi$ os
 Hesych，well explains Hú日cova＇$\Delta a \_$ávion $\mu \alpha \nu \tau \iota \kappa \dot{d} \nu$, a conjuring damon．

16．dpyariav\} This word, from iphá\}eotal, to make money（as we say），signifies gain．Tots nupiots．Fischer and Vater take this as plural for singular，as in Lu．xix．33．That passage， however，is of a different nature，and to call in enallage were not only ill judged，but unneces－ sary，since Grot．and Wall have fully proved， that the common possession of a slave，especially when exercising any gainful profession，was not unfrequent．

17．Soǜoc toû 日eoū－rwt．］Though the ex－
 tiles to signify those devoted to any God as his Priests，yet as odds ocornpias was one quite un－ known to them，we might imagine both expres－ sions were derived from persons who had heard Paul and Timothy preach，（who might probably use such language of themselves）but that it is best to suppose the words pronounced by the damon，through the organs of the girl，and thus bearing the same honourable testimony to the Apostles，that had been borne by the demons to our Lord．

19．¿そj̀ $0_{c} \nu$ ］There seems to be，as Valckn． remarks，a parin！＇musia with the preceding engin－
$\theta \in \nu$ ，since with the going out of the den away their hope of gain．They perceive gone，when they found that the girl longer the power of divination．＇Ertilat ＇having［caused to be］apprehended：＇ 17．$\times x 1.30$ ．and Lu．xxiii． 26 ．Enkvo． term，like oúpecy and the Latin rapers． used of impleading any one，and con－ obliging him to go to judgment．The， just after is a general term，in the place is，in the next verse，substituted the $m$ ． one orparyyol；for so，it seems，the e at Philippi were called．On the mum orpariyol，the origin of the appal other matters of antiquities，see Wets． in Recens．Synop．
 turbance to．＇The $d^{\prime} \kappa$ is intensive． made was two－fold， 1 ．that they wert of the peace，and 2．teachers of $u_{1}$ gious customs and rites；both ch falling under the cognizance of the And though the Romans were not in in the permission to foreigners to ， according to their consciences，it wa that there should be no public ate selytism．And whenever the forme connected with the latter，the ma bound to punish．In＇Iovóaèoe iv is suggested that their offence is $H$ persons being，as foreigners and of a nation，those who ought the less tared so to do．
 that of the Latin scindere and the words in Greek ；and denotes a．has； by another，a violent，stripping ．
 and Dod．Sic．L．xvii．35．oi to pry temporary punishment to sati of and as reserving the final exam charge for another occasion．



















24. riv dowrépay фu入.] Jails were not so strongly built at the outer part as the interior, to which there was access by many gates, and where sometimes there were subterraneous dungeons. Chains, too, were then added, and a machine called छúdov, in which the arms and head were sometimes confined as in our pillory, but more frequently the legs only; not, however, as in our stocks; for the machine was one in which the feet were constrained and bruised. Hence it was called тodoкáкn and modoot $\alpha \phi \eta$. Of this Grot., Pric., and Elsn. adduce many examples.
26. aveć $\left.x^{\theta} \eta \sigma a y-x a ̃ \pi a l\right]$ The opening of doors of themselves was always thought to attest the presence of God, or an angel. See xii. 10 .
 this, most Commentators understand that the chains of the prisoners were relaxed; though not so much as to place them quite at liberty. This, however, is difficult to conceive, and, from the use of the word in the Classical writers (see the examples cited by Wets.) dvé $\theta \eta$ can only signify 'were freed from chains.' Yet, as the dowrs were, at the same time, opened, it would seem surprising that the prisoners should not have made their escape; which is by many attributed to extreme astonishment! In the reason assigned by Grotius, namely, Dicine interposition, we may far better acquiesce. I cannot, however, help suspecting that for mavтosy we should read rácos, as referred to Oupai, or
 frequent enallage, in which an adjective is made to agree not so much with the antecedent, as with some kindred word, as here $\theta u \rho$ érpes. Now chains are applicable to doors as well as to persms, and were so applied, as I find from Athen. 517. C. iott oupis-nai aúti diúvel
 Triv $\theta u p i d a$.
27. Euxroos] A word only occurring in the later writers.
28. $\mu \eta \delta \dot{¢} \nu$-како́v] An euphemism, like that of Xenoph. cited by Wets.: ddedoiket $\gamma$ ajp. $\mu \eta$ Tt iaurd̀ déjáनŋrat detyóv. Doddr. thinks Paul collected the jailor's intention from some desperate words which be had uttered.
29. aiтías фڤ̈̈a] Plural for sing., say the Commentators. "Ex-ponos. Various causes might produce this feeling, and among these, that of ave, as in the presence of Divine legates, attested to be such by the supernatural occurrence already witnessed.
30. $\xi_{\infty}$ ] i. e. out of the inner jail.
 Synop., proved that this cannot mean 'what must I do to be safe?' viz. from the punishment of the magistrates; but, as the whole of the context requires, 'by what means can I attain eternal salvation?' He knew they professed to show the means, and their commission to do it was now established beyond doubt.
31. xioravoov dri- 0 Ov] 'Embrace the Christian religion, and thou and all thy family shall be put into the way of salvation.' It is taken for granted that his family become Christians as well as himself.
33. iv dkeivy Tip ion rive v.] 'at that very hour of the night, unseasonable as it was. "Biovare dixd tion $\pi \lambda$. It is not necessary to suppose $\lambda$ 入ovot put for d $\lambda$. кaөapi\}cov, with Pisc., or, with Kypke, Kuin., and Campb., to take the $d^{\pi} d$ in the sense propter, supplying бш́мата. The true mode, 1 conceive, of taking the passage is to consider it as a blending of two forms of expression, namely, eidovacy aüroùs.

















 $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$.

 －simar．is for dmo入ov́cov $\beta$ ．aimat．

37．＂́фף mods aúroús」i．e．to the beadles，by a message，it should seem，sent by the Jailor．In סєipaytes－iк $\beta \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o v \sigma a \nu$ there is such spirit， brevity，and point（almost each word forming a head of complaint）as could not easily be pa－ ralleled even in the writings of Demosthenes． ＇Aкaraкpitous signifies＇not found guilty，on trial，of any wrong．＇On the law，and especially the Roman law on this point，and on the privi－ leges of citizens in foreign countries，the Com－ mentators adduce numerous Classical citations and references．In what sense Paul was enabled to call himself a Roman citizen，is a point much debated among the Commentators，but nothing has been with certainty determined．Some think it was on the ground that Tarsus was a Roman colony，or at least a municipium．The municipia were properly Italian towns on which had been conferred the jus civitatis，whereby the citizens of those places had the public and private rights of Quirites，and moreover made their own laws，and elected their own mages－ trates．There were，however，municipia which had not the right of suffrage；and so possessed not the full jus civitatis．Yet Tarsus（Paul＇s birth－place）was neither a colony，nor a mini－ cipium，but merely an urbs liberu．See Pliny $\mathrm{V}_{\text {．}}$ 27．Now these free cities lived under their own laws，had their own magistrates，were inge－ pendent of the jurisdiction of the Roman pres－ sident，and were not occupied by Roman gar－ risons．With this freedom the Tarsæans had been presented by Augustus，as a compensation for the damages they had sustained in the cause of Julius Cesar，under various calamities at－ tending the Civil War．That the Tarsæans had not the jus ciritatis Roman is also hence ap－ parent，that the Roman Tribune，notwith－
standing he knew Paul to be a Tarsxan 39．），ordered him to be scourged， though he desisted as soon as he underst was a Roman citizen．See xxii．27．seq． there seems reason to prefer the opin： who maintain，that some one of Paul had this freedom given him for sur rendered to Cesar in the civil war－

When it is said $\boldsymbol{\eta} \mu \bar{\alpha} \mathbf{s}$＇Peonatious i Commentators，supposing that Silo． Roman citizen，would take the sins－ for the plural，dignitat is gratin． $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ necessity to resort to any such precar for though that Silas is（as they sis else called a Roman citizen，be trinA， where said，or even hinted，that is That he was，his very name＇Silas， renders probable．Nor was the $j u$ its most limited sense，then so vert be acquired．
－os $\gamma \alpha \rho$ ］An elliptical formu similar ones in Latin and English． brevity（to be supplied by rose： like）is very well suited to a feelin lion．＇A $1 \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ d $\lambda \theta \delta \nu$ res sec．A sort action expressive of their convia innocence．It appears from the to have been not infrequently re especially in this very country of M the neighbouring one of Thessaly．
 by entreating them to over l jury．
 this idiom，and would read Av． MSS．give no countenance to tl been proved by Wolf，Alberti．Hel and Valckn．，that eíép $X \in \sigma \theta a \varepsilon$ et used in the sense＇to enter i house．＇
－тарєкá入є val］We may I















senses of admonishing，and cuhorting．See Note on 2 Cor．ii． 4.
 objects to our English Fersion＇a synagogue of the Jews，and would render＇the synagogue，＇ as signifying merely that the Jews of the sur－ rounding district had their synagogue there． That，however，is so litule satisfactory（see xiv． 1. and Note，and compare xvii．10．）that it is better to suppose the Article to have here crept in from the $\dot{\eta} \nu$ preceding．It is recorded as being not found in three of the most antient MSS．，and，no doubt，in several others，such minute points escaping the most careful collators． To suppose，with many eminent Commentators， that that was the only synagogue in Macedonia， though there might be many proseucha，is too hypothetical，and is discountenanced by xiv． 1.

3．SLavoiyoul］．scil．Tas ypaфais，as in Lu． xxiv．32．，opening the sense \＆c．Mapatiod－ $\mu$ evor，propounding，viz．by laying before them the evidence．At $\delta \dot{o} \tau 1$ õv－ijuiv the Commenta－ tors remark on the transition from the oratio obliqua to the directa．See Acts i． 4.

4．т $\rho о \sigma е к \lambda \eta \rho \omega i \theta \eta \sigma \nu$ тä II．］The verb has a reciprocal sense，＇joined themselves to，＇＇took their lot with．
 нóvesv infra v．12．\＆xiii．50．，＇honourable matrons，＇wives or widows．Thus Apuleius speaks of feminas primates．

5．Tsin ayopaionv］＇Ayopaĩos denotes＇be－ longing to the forum，or market，＇and carries various significations according to the business done there，whether as applied to things，or persons．See Recens．Synop，and Wets．As ap－ plied to the latter，it denoted（with dyojers） market people，some of whom being petty chap－ men，others acting as porters，nay，even mere idlers，who，like the Lazzaroni at Naples，almost liced in the market，the term came at length to mean persons of the basest sort，the dregs of mociety．

Movnpois is wrongly rendered by Bp．Pearce and Abp．Newc．，＇ricked．＇Yet so almost all the recent Interpreters take it．But as it is
 to render tiva＇s divðpas xovnpois＇some mean fellows．＇This signification of rovnods is in－ deed somewhat rare，and therefore did not occur to the Commentators；but I could adduce se－ veral examples．The following will suffice．

 because of his meanness．Aristoph．Fq．181． where to $\mu \dot{\alpha}$ 子as yiyveotal is opposed movnpds $\kappa_{\alpha} \dot{\xi} \xi \alpha^{2} \rho \bar{a} s$ elvat．And in Xenophon the sodical movpool are often opposed to the of xpyorol，the better sort．Sturn．Lex．Xen．will supply many examples．See also Lucian i． 483. Hence may be understood Thucyd．vi．53．$\delta_{i} \dot{\alpha}$

 carédouy．where all the Translators and Com－ mentators have fallen into the same blunder as on this passage of the N．T．By Arrian the term is used in the sense of paltry，as applied to things．And possibly the framers of our com－ mon Version meant this when they rendered ＇leved fellows；＇for in the passage of Thucyd． viii．73．Hobbes renders $\mu 0 \chi^{\theta} \eta \rho d y$ by a leud fellow．Indeed that word may very well have such a sense，since in that signification it is derived from the A．S．Lœpb gregarius，＇one of the mob，from Leob， 2 mob．
－Tठो $\delta \eta \mu$ ои ］Not，＇the people，＇as E．V．； much less＇the mob，＇as Doddr．renders；but the popular assembly；a signification frequent in Thucyd．，Xenoph．，and the best writers，e．gr．
 Comp．xvi． 20.

6．©oupov］This is to be taken like enkurav at xvi．19．where see Note．Ho入ıтápxas，＇the city magistrates；＇a later form for wo入irapxos， which is found in Atneas Poliorc．C． 26. Tiv olk．avaनтaтょ́бavtes．This expression，like a corresponding one in our own language，is to be taken in a popular sense，and not to be too rigorously interpreted．＇Avaor，is a word only found elsewhere in the LXX．It is for avaota－ тdv тotijavees，and that for avareiovres in L．u．xxiii． 5.
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7. Úтоöéófitat] 'has received as guests and friends.' So in Lu. xix.6. James ii. 25. and often in the Classical writters. It is for déxea日at ixd tò oiкov. See Gen. xix. 8. 'Aтevaytı. The word properly signifies opposite to; but here contrary to.
9. кal $\lambda \alpha \beta$. rd iкavò ] 'and they (i.e. the magistrates) taking surety.' Td inavdv $\lambda$. is a translation of the latin law phrase satisfactionem arcipere, the opposite of which is iкavov doūvat. What the nature of the engagement was, we are left to conjecture. It probably was, that he would send away Paul and Silas forthwith, and would undertake to keep the peace.
11. oütol dè] scil. 'Ioudaĩot. Eúyevéatcpot. Not more noble (for the men, we may suppose, were tradesmen of the lower sort) but more ingenuous and well disposed. So the best of the later Commentators take the word, and they adduce examples of this sense, which occurs especially in the later writers. Perhaps, however, both significations may be included, viz. the better sort of persons, more respectable and better disposed. And so Chrys. seems to have
 i. e. the better sort and better disposed people.
 where I have fully explained the idiom and adduced many examples.
 to have no force, and is omitted in several MSS. It must, however, be retained, since we may better account for its omission than for its insertion. To account for its being used here, it is proper to bear in mind, that $\kappa \alpha \theta^{\prime}$ vi $\mu$ épay is often used with the Article for the adjective $\dot{\eta} \mu \in \rho t \nu o l$. The substantive is generally expressed, but sometimes omitted, and left to be supplied from the context, or the subject. Here deos may be supplied, and the common ellip. of катai supposed. Thus the sense will be, 'in their daily habits of
life; equivalent to the Thucgdidean Tor $\mathrm{E} \mathrm{u}^{\prime}$
 diattav. And so the best writers say Tó $k=-$ ë $\mu \mathrm{c}$, 'quantum ad me attinet.'

- dvaxpivorres] This is well explained Chrys. dyepeuvā̈res.

12. Tต̄̀ év $X$.] See Note on xiii. 50. I word belongs both to puvaincin and to aivipa
13. бaleúovtes] This word, from ori入os. surge of the sea, signifies to agitate. The ( sical writers have many passages where polit:agitation is compared to the tossing of a er pestuous sea. See Soph. OEd. Tyr. 25.
 to what sea? and would read Өeoralíav. I query, however, may be satisfactorily answer. In the case of places situated, like Bersea, tween two seas, to go to the sea must denote the nearest sea, and if embarkation for a voy be implied, the nearest sea-port may be ㄴ. posed. That, in the present case, was m probably Pydna. Thus in a kindred paseage Thucyd. i. 137., Admetus, to remove Ther: tocles out of the reach of those who were seek
 which must mean the Egean, and, as we aftwards learn, to Pydna. Had tìp Oalaco been written, the ddriatic must have been a derstood.

The wis $\begin{gathered}\text { efl our English Translators ren. } 13\end{gathered}$ ' as if,' or ' as it were;' which compels thern suppose that this going to the sea wras onl? stratagem to deceive his enemies, who m:suppose he was taking ship, when he, in tal should go to his destination by land. The however, is but a slender foundation on whil to erect such a notion. There can be no do: 1 but that the two words wis $\dot{\epsilon} \pi l$ are to be tak together, and understood, as in many passac of the Classical writers cited by the Comment
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aa $\sigma \sigma a y$. to which I could add others from Thucyd., where the wis is pleonastic. Or the sense may be unto, i.e. down to. And so d $\pi l$ riv $\theta \dot{d} \lambda$. in Thucyd. vi. 66. So the Vulg. has usque ad, and the Syr. ad.
15. oi кaӨ,
 gores, as in a kindred passage at ix. 39. катni a ahoy aüdy ais K . The present term, however, is equally correct. so Thucyd. iv. 78. a ateotnaar (scil. oi äyovtes) aiutdy is sion. Where 1 have adduced examples from Xenoph., Plutarch, and Jambl. We may here render, - those who had the charge of conveying Paul brought him to Athens.' The construction requires an els, or dat, or de, as in the earliest example of this idiom, Hon. Od. y. 274. ar. חúdoube. Wets., however, cites an example of $\mu$ expel from Arran, which comes near to the coos of St. Luke.
16. $i_{v}$ aide] This is added, by a Hebraism, as in Dan. vii. 15. " 1 was, grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body;" which passage was perhaps in the mind of St. Luke. Kacelòmioy, 'full of idols.' This force of kava is found in many words. as ката́devipos, катд́джелоs \&c. With respect to the fact, it is fully established and copiously illustrated by Wets.; e. gr. Pausanies says Athens had more images than all the rest of Greece; and Petronius tells us, "it was easier to find there a God than a man.". To the passages of Pausan., Strabo, and Lucian cited by Wets., I add Thucyd. ii. 38. 日volats dietnlois vomi乌ovtos.
17. $\tau \bar{\eta}$ dopa] There were many marketplaces, the moi considerable being the Ceraminus, or old, and the Forum Eretriacum, or new Forum ; the former of which is supposed to be the one here meant by lkenius and schleus., the latter by Kuin. and indeed most Commentaters. And that this was by far the more frequested, being in the most thickly inhabited part of the city, confirm e the latter opinion. Tove सapar.; 'those whom he might happen to meet with.' The Forum was the best adapted to his purpose, because it was (as in all the Eastern countries up to the present day) the place where people met for conversation. And from the citations of Wets. it appears that that was the place where Socrates and many other Philosophers had been accustomed to hold their discussions.
18. Extкoupeicicu cal tầ $\Sigma \tau$.] The Epicureans were practically Atheists, since they held that the world was neither created by God, nor under the direction of his Providence. Pleasure they accounted the summum bonum, and virtue to be practised only for the sake of pleasure, not for its own sake. They maintained that the soul was material, like the body, and would perish with it, leaving nothing to be either hoped or feared after death. The Stoics did, indeed, believe in the existence of a God, but held such chimerical notions of his nature, attributes, and providence, as rendered that belief almost nugatory. They maintained, that both Good and man were bound by a necessitas fatalis; that the wise man yielded in no respect to God, of whom they believed that his nature was fire, and diffused throughout the world. On the condition of the soul after death, and on the existence of a state of rewards and punishments, they varied in opinion; but all denied the immortality of a future state. Nay, some thought that, sooner or later, the soul merged in the celestial fire of the Deity. Thus while the former denied the existence, or at least Providance, of God; the latter, though professing to believe both, yet, by ascribing all human events to fate, destroyed the foundation of all religion as much as the former. It is obvious that both the above systems were as far as possible removed from the doctrines of Christianity; and therefore it is no wonder that the later should have been both unaccountable and unacceptable to these Philosophers. There were, besides, two other sects, the Platonists, and the Peripatetics, the latter of whom probably came not near Paul, since their places of discussion were far removed. The opinions of the former made far nearer approaches than those of the rest to the doctrines of Christianity; and these probably formed the far greater part of those who gave a qualified approbation of $S_{\text {t }}$. Paul's doctrines by proposing to hear him again on the subject of the immortality of the soul.

- $\left.\sigma u \nu^{i} \beta_{a} \lambda \lambda o{ }^{2}\right]$ Sub. $\lambda$ ojous, which is sometimes expressed.
- $\sigma$ repmodóyos] The word was used propertly of those small birds, sparrows \&c. which live by picking up scattered seeds; but metaphorically, to denote those paupers, who frequented the market-places, and lived by picking up any scattered or refuse produce; and. genes




rally, persons of abject condition without any regular means of support. Again, as the tribes of anall birds which live by picking up seeds are e-pecially garrulous, the word came to denote a priter, and some eminent Commentators think that is the sense here. But probably both senses may be intended, viz. "an insignificunt babbler."

18. oi Bє́] Sub. ènçov, 'spoke [in answer].' 큽os $\delta a, \mu . к а т а \gamma \gamma .$, a commender of foreign deities.' We are not here to anderstand Gods in the full sense of the term. It has been proved by the Commentators cited in Recens. Synop. ( to whose matter I have subjoined much that is important from Max. Tyr., Jambl., Plutarch, l.iban., Diog. Laert., Dion. Halic., Hindar, \&c.) that there was properly a distinction, though not always observed, between $\theta \in o l$ and $\delta \boldsymbol{j} / \mu о \nu \in s$, by which the former denoted Jupiter and the Gods by origin, the latter those who had become so, though originally men. These, according to some, included the ifposes, as Hercules; though others made a third class of them. The above, then, were all the classes that, properly speaking, were reckoned as Dicinities. But the Pagan Theology comprehended another order of beings, which held the midway between divinities and mere men, and acted as mediators between God and men, by revealing the divine will, and helping the imbecility of man. This was the סatpúvia, one of which was said by Socrates to visit him ; on which, Xenoph. Mem. i. 1, 2. tells us, was founded the charge кануà daumónca ciapé$\rho \epsilon i \nu$, almost the same expression as that used of St. Paul. Some eminent Commentators think that the Athenians meant by this to express that the place claimed by St. Paul for Jesus was in this last class. But it is plain that what they heard the Apostle say of Jesus would give them a notion of a Being who was a daupeiv, and that one of the higher order. And there is great reason to believe that daujóviov was sometimes used in the sense of $\delta a \mu \mu \nu \nu$, as in the foregoing passage of Xenoph. (as is plain from the charge being elsewhere worded as тd терl $\theta \in \infty$ у каєขотоцєìv) and those of Diog. Laert., Dio Cass., Elian and Josephus, cited by Wets., where the ex-
 $\rho \in \iota \nu$, and そévous óaluovas clod́yetv are equivalent.
 that many eminent Interpreters, antient and modern, should take aváor. (written 'Avóora$\sigma(v)$ as the name of a new Goddess. It is true that there is something to urge in favour of that view, (see Recens. Synop.) but the common interpretation bears in its simplicity the stamp of truth, viz. 'preached Jesus and the resurrection of the dead through Ilim ;'He being the first fruits of those that slept. This, too, is required by v. 31. ivaनtrías aúrdy iк veкposy. and 32.
 use just before of the plural sacpóvia, it may readily be accounted for from an idiom of fre-
quent occurrence and common to all hagrer and mostly used when any charge is made sis:any one. Thus it may be considered $\geq$ c hyperbole. It is not, however, improbable: they might so far mistake St. Paul as to sif: that he preached two Gods, i. e. Gind, and Christ. The God (namely, Jehorah) prez: by him and avowedly different from the $1: y$ of the Athenians, might very well be esti:by them a foreign God.
 not agreed whether this expression is to :ry garded as importing violence, or not. Ther examples in the N.T. of both uses. The fort (which is supported by the antient Versions, 2 is adopted by many Commentators,) is agreeable to the contert. And it is coantear by the fact, that the Areopagus was a tn for the trial of impiety, such as the introdu of the worship of foreign religions. let, all, it may be doubted whether there was: thing of apprehension properly so called.. there is no appearance of any regular tris fore the court of Areopagus. There is, is, reason to think, that this court retained $v_{2}$ shadow of its antient consequence, and, life Inquisition in many Catholic countries of present time, had abated much of its ant severity in matters of religion, otherwise unto and foreign deities would not have been 90 * shipped as they then were at Athens. Asto proof of which cannot be imagined than the lowing passage of Athen. ix. p. 372., sdducw. me in Recens. Synop., and said of the Ather:



 given up by Bentley and Porson as corrups. may, however, be very well emended. For Ti read тіทтו, and for wemolpaces read тeri
 junction with the preceding verse, the words conceive, suggest rather a tumultuary proceing on the part of the two clasees of persons before mentioned. They, it should seem, thor: proper to call Paul to a public and solemn count, and considered no place so proper a hill called Areopagus. Thus the words:
 aptly compares from Plautus " possum seire, profectus, cujus sis, aut quid veneris ?'") as at Bovióreө a yvoyat. Paul, too, does not 2 dress them as judges, nor seek any justificat of his conduct, but as philosophers. If, the any of them were, as was Dionysius, Areopagitthey were there not as sitting ex of cio, but private individuals. Perhaps this may accour for the little seriousness or ceremony which it Apostle experienced.

- סuvd́pe日a $\boldsymbol{y}^{v i s i v a t] ~ T h i s ~ i s ~ H e l l e n i s ~}$ Greek, both in the use of dúvacoas for 'to i. permitted, and in the not prefixing some pa ticle of interrogation.









20. EeviYouta] for Kéva, strange. Literally, things which strike us with surprise. Anoas, ears. This use of the word in the plural is thought to be rarely found out of the N. T. Yet $I$ have in Recess. Synop. adduced examples from Eurip., mElian., Herodian, Polyb., and Chemist.
 all the Athenians' \&c.
 the distinction between the $\alpha \sigma$ col and $\xi i v o t$ was at Athens very frequent. The dorol considered themselves as alone possessing any rank. All the rest were included indiscriminately under the name pivot. They called themselves the first inhabitants, the aürox ${ }^{\theta}$ ones; the rest they styled new comers. And Kypke thus observes: "The inhabitants of Athens were divided into $\pi$ rodiras, ме́rotкo, and そévor. Only the rohirat (ie. the doroi) and the pivot are sometimes opposed, in a more extensive sense, by which the latter comprehended both the $\mu$ éтoisot and the pivot. Hence the question arises whether the $i \pi$ io j $\eta$ moüvers pivot are to be taken in this more extended sense, as denoting all the pivot (viz. who had not the jus ciritatis) or only those who, not having their fixed habitation at Athens. sojourned there for a time. But I find the phrase only used in the stricter sense." And so Thucyd.
 difference between the $\mu$ érousol and $\xi$ £́voc seems to have been this, that the former were residents, the latter sojourners. Moreover, the $\mu$ érotxot, had a sort of jus Latin, by a particular ceremony, which included an oath of allegiance to the government; whereas the $\xi \in v o i$, who were only sojourners, were not called upon to go through such a ceremony.

- els oùdèv ẽtepoy cùkaipour] null rel magus racabant. Euкaĩp. is for oxoda乡ety, by a use confined to the later writer. The next words exactly characterise the chief traits of the Achenan garrulity, and rage for novelty, on which see many passages from the Classical writers in Recens. Synop. At Athens there were places called $\lambda_{\text {copal, }}$, devoted to the reception of newsmongers.

22. In this brief, but pithy, discourse (which would doubtless have been longer, had it not been broken off by the scoffs of some and the listlessness and abrupt departure of others) the Apostle wisely accommodates himself to the circumstances of his hearers. After a complymental exordium, such as was usual in publicly addressing the Athenians, as also by a preocespatio hencernlentia not unfrequent in the antient

Orations, (of which those in Thucyd. supply abundant examples) he notices the occasion which led to his addressing them, and shows, that it is his desire to enable them to satisfy their wish of worshipping even unknown gods, by pointing out that great Being ( to them hitherto unknown), the only and the true God; some of whose chief attributes, and the various benefits He hath wrought, he then proceeds to recount. From thence he infers the duty incumbent on his creatures of seeking, i. e. worshipping, Him; at the same time noticing certain erroneous modes thereof which had originated in utter ignorance of His true nature. This introduces an exhortation to abandon these errors, fortified by an announcement of a future day of jugmeat, and punishment for all wilful disobedience to the will of God. Now this implied a present state of accountableness, and the duty of guiding themselves by the light of that Gospel, which God had been pleased to reveal by Jesus Christ.

- ietoidathoveoripous] Almost all Commentatars of eminence for the last two centuries have, with reason, been of opinion, that the word must here have the good sense, i.e. ' more than others attentive to religious matters.' That such was the case with the Greeks generally is attested by Mitford in his History of Greece, Vol. 11. p. 304.; and that it was so with the Athenians particularly is proved by a multitude of Classical citations. Sophocles' matchless drama of the (Edipus Col. abounds in testimonies to this effect. See 260. 1006. 1187., as also Aristoph. Nub. 300. sqq. Fechyl., too, and Eurip. both frequently bear this attestation. That the word is susceptible of the above sense has been established by a multitude of proofs; and that it must be so taken here, is plain, both from the air of the context, and from a consideration of the circumstances. The other interpretation would involve such a violation, as the Apostle could never have intended, of that decorium, which was no where so studiously proserved as at Athens, or so rigidly exacted from public speakers. Beza, Campb., and Newt. imagine that the words cis detoto. ines $\theta_{\text {coco }}$ import a softened disapprobation, q. d. I perceive that ye are somewhat too religious. This, however, seems every way untenable.
 rather (as Erasm., Kopje, and Schleus. render) modes of worshipping God, as shown in temples, altars, images, sacrifices, \&c.
 rise to no little debate. The difficulty hinges on this, that although we find from Pausan. 1. 1.



\& v. 14., and Philostr. Vit. Ap. vi. 3., that there were at Athens altars inscribed 'to unknown (iords.' yet no passage is adduced which makes mention of any altar 'to an unknown God.' Jerome, Erasm., and others would remove this ditficulty by supposing, that the inscription was : - Ayvciotoss Ocvis. or rather Oeois Agias mal
 vocs. But, as Bp. Middl. observes, "that is a most improbable supposition ; and, indeed, the manner in which the inscription is introduced makes it incredible that St. Paul could intend merely a remote or vague allusion." Thus, ( huin. observes) the whole force of the Apostle's argument would be taken away, nay, his asserfion would not be true. Therefore, "that the altar (as Middl. remarks) was inscribed simply 'Arvoiotw $\theta \in$ फ̣, must either be conceded, or all inquiry will be in vain." For, as Baronius and Wonna have seen, "though there might be several altars at Athens and elsewhere inscribed to unknown Gods generally, or to the unksown Gods of any particular part of the world, yet that there might occasionally be one inscribed to one of them, is extremely probable." Bp. Middl., indeed, (too implicitly following Wonna) thinks that the words of the author of the Philopatris
 $\nu a t s$, are decisive, that 'Ayvoírye $\theta \in 由$ in the singular, was a well known inscription." Which uould, indeed, be the case if the Philopatris stood in the same circumstances as almost every other work of the Classical writers preserved to us. But, in fact, that tract (which was written, as Gesner has proved) not by Lucian, but by an imitator of his style and manner, who lived 200 years after him, in the time of the Emperor Julian, and who bore the same name, contains (as I can myself affirm, after having carefully examined the whole for the purpose of knowing) little short of tuenty passages written with manifest allusion to various parts of the Scriptures, chiefly of the N. T. There can be no doubt, then, that the writer had the present passage in view, and consequently his testimony will only serve to confirm our belief (which, however, is of some consequence) that the singular number was used by St. Paul. But though no other writer seems to have recorded the existence of an altar, or altars, so inscribed, yet it has probability to support it, and no argument from the silence of authors can be drawn to the discredit of any writer of unimpeached integrity.
The question, however, as Bp. Middl. observey, is, "was this inscription meant to be applied to one of a possible multitude, as if we ahould impute any kindness or any injury to an unknown benefactor, or enemy,-or was it meant to be significant of the one true God?" He proves that the latter opinion (though the general one) is ungrounded. It involves, as he observes, a great improbability that an inscription so offensive to a Polytheistical people could have been tolerated. And he proves that it is inconsistent with the propriety of the Article. The omission of the Aricle, and the pasition of the words re-
quire (as he shows both from the rales of $x$ dinary language and the castom of inseriptios that the words should be rendered to an if known God,' or 'to a God unknown.' Aadiz truly observes, that the discourse of the Aparix is, even according to that way of taking the sj: vшioru, very pertinent, and that the mention $:$ any unknown Deity gave him a sufficient bave for the purpose in question. Hour it happet. that there was an altar so inscribed, is a matr on which there has been great variety of opinis. It seems, however, most probable, that the alic had been erected by the public on account a some remarkable benefit received, which seemes attributable to some God, though it was nocertain to which. There can be little doubt but tu: benefit was the remooal of the Pextilerare ut Atheus described by Thucydides, and wh:threatened at one time to depopulate the cit when, as Thucyd. tells us, "all human brif was zain, and Divine aid fruitlessly implored. Now when the Athenians, at length, experience? so great and unexpected a deliverance, so reigious a people would not fail to ascribe it : some God. And then was probably the tire when the altar in question (and perhaps athers was erected. This is supported by the opinions of some antients mentioned by Isidore and Thenphylact ; though some thought that the alta: was erected before the Pestilence was staycu. But that is contradicted by the testimony on Thucyd. ii. 47., who says that "they clesisted frim all religious deprecations." The above view :also confirmed by Diog. Laert. i. 10. For thonsi that passage has been, for the last century, rjected as inapposite, yet it is perhaps not is. The story he tells is indeed fabulous, and was doubtless invented by the priests in after ages to support a sinking cause ; but still his narrative contains, I conceive, a nucleus of truth; namely. that, on the cessation of the Pestilence, altars were erected, one at each considerable town. (and others, even what were called $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu \mathrm{moc}$, were, as we find from Thucyd., provided with them) asd sacrifices offered up "to a God unknown." one who had wrought out their deliverance. Thest altars would be, at first, all of them (as Diog. Laert. says) dvóvvuot, uninscribed, and many would afterwards continue so. Some, howeve:of them, it is probable, and certainly the one a: Athens, had inscribed 'Ayvoiorap Oces.. This probably led to the custom, in after ages, of erecting altars 'Ayvaiotous $\theta$ coīs kal Eévous; ol which many vestiges are found in the Classica! writers, and to which the inscription seen by Jerome, no doubt, belonged, and which appears to be the only record of such an inscription at full length.
24.is $\theta$ eds-катоикei \&rc.] The best Commentators rightly remark, that this aeemingly plain statement of the truth is so skilfully managed, as to be directed against the irreligious scepticism of the philosophers and higher ranks, as well as the superstition of the common people. On the sentiment oùk dy xetnowotrprois \&c. see vii. 48. and Note.


















25. on $\theta$ eparevietat] The sense seems to be, - is not [to be] served or ministered unto by the hands of men,' i. e. by temples, sacrifices, \&c. This is the primary sense of $\theta$ eparcuic. See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 51. No. 5. At трoбdeó$\mu e n o s ~ t h e r e ~ m a y ~ s e e m ~ t o ~ b e ~ a n ~ e l l i p . ~ o f ~ w i s . ~ B u t, ~$ in fact, the apposition includes that sense.

For tà rávra many MSS. have кatà тà wáyra, which was preferred by Wets. and edited by Math., but on insecure grounds. For the authority of MSS. is very slender in so minute a variation. Besides, the sense yielded by катa waived is very unsatisfactory; whereas, that of anal ta тávra is extremely apposite, viz. "all things necessary to the sustaining of life, and which are particularized in a similar passage at xiv. 17.
26. alलatos] 'race.' See Note on Joh.i. 13. Wets. compares Anthol. iii. 31, 6. "Aortaives almatos. and Virg. sanguine ab uno. With respect to the sentiment, by thus tracing back the origin of mankind, the Apostle meant to elude the vanity of the Athenians, who maintained that they were aúrox $\begin{gathered}\text { gives and } \quad \gamma \eta \gamma \in v e i s . \text { See my }\end{gathered}$ Note on Thucyd. i. 2. \& ii. 36. With expos
 may be rendered ' appointing certain determinate seasons [for the inhabiting] and the boundaries of the regions they should inhabit.' There is reference to the records of the early colonization and settling of the earth in the Book of Moses. For sapor. many MSS. and early Fd. have т poor., which is adopted by almost every Editor from Beng. and Wets. to Gater; and, I think, rightly; though the old reading might be defended.
27. ci doa $\boldsymbol{y}^{6} \psi \eta \lambda$. \&ce.] These words are exegetical of the foregoing, and may be literally rendered, ' [to try] if indeed they could feel out and find him.' A Hendiadys for al $\psi \eta \lambda a \phi \eta^{\prime}-$ faves eüporev, 'if by investigating they could find out His attributes, will,' \&cc. It is not imppossible that St. Paul may have had in mind Plato Phased. 847 . (cited by Bulkley) where he
censures those who feel after God in the dark, by resting in the investigation of second causes, without carrying up their inquiries to that first cause, to which all other things gre owing, and which established that admirable order of things which we behold.
28. iv à̇rā-domév] Many here recognize a climax. But it rather seems to be a strong mode of expression, for 'To Him we owe life and every faculty connected with it-by Him we are what we are.'
 of which Wets. cites an example from Longinus. Toù yàp yévos dr رév. These words occur both in Arat. Phren. 5. and in a Hymn of Cleanthes on Jove v. 5., given at length in Recens. Synop. Similar sentiments are adduced from several other writers by the Commentators, as Mind.
 which I have added an interesting passage of Apollonius Exist. 44., no doubt fabricated by Philostratus, and formed on an imitation of this passage.
30. toùs $\mu$ èv oǜ Xpóvous- $\mu$ етav.] q. d. 'However, though God gave men plain tokens of his existence and providence, yet they long entertained erroneous notions of both, and did not worship him aright. These errors, arising from ignorance, God long was pleased to overlook and bear with, (compare xiv. 16.) but now,' \&c. Metavoeiv, ice. of their idolatry and other sins. " Repentance, says Hierocles (probably enlightend by the (Gospel), is itself the beginning of Philosophy."
 that you should obey God's orders, repent, and reform your lives, for you must give an account,' \&c. 'By סıкatorúvp, i. e. in such strictness and justice as must exclude all mercy to the impsnitent and unreformed. 'Avojoi. The term is ( (E)cumenius observes) spoken olкороииксйs, denoting the Goodman Jesus \&c. Míorav $\boldsymbol{\text { aa- }}$ pa бX©义. The phrase, here and often, signifies, ' to produce faith in any thing, or confidence in
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any one's pretensions, by adducing sufficient proofs.'
 to the opinion of those who here recognize a wish to hear more ; for if so, why should they not hear it then, for the Apostle had not wearied his gay fastidious hearers with obscure prolixity. The feeling seems to have been that of indifference and distaste; or rather we may consider this as a civil way of saying, We will hear no more of this at present. Some other time will do. See Doddr. and Scott. See Luke xxiv. 25. Thus the Apostle's reception was so very discouraging, that he, in disgust, breaks off his discourse, which, therefore, may be said to have been as much interrupted and cut short as Stephen's was, and others recorded in this Book, nay, even some of our Lord's discourses to the Jews, as recorded by St. John. Had that not been the case, St. Paul would doubtless have enlarged on the nature of that religion whose divine origin had been thus attested by God himself.
34. ko $\lambda \lambda \eta$ \#ééves] ' become his converts.' See Note on v. 13. Kevin, 'a matron,' no doubt, of some rank, as being here mentioned. The glosses (for they are no more) of the most antient MSS. attest the early belief of this. Propriety so demaids the masculine ërepoc, that it is strange Markl. should conjecture eco $\rho a t$, which would really be solecistic.
XVIII. 2. 'Iovóaiov] Whether he was then a Christian is by the recent Commentators thought doubtful. But St. Luke often omits (as indeed do all antient writers) minute circumstances, which may easily be supplied; and this probably is one of them; especially since the expression $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta e \nu$ au $\boldsymbol{u}$ is implies a sort of connexion, which was probably that of identity of religion. Now there had been a congregation of Christians at Rome, from the earliest' period of the Gospel, which is supposed to have originated with certain of those who had been present at the feast of Pentecost, when the Holy Ghost was imparted; and was doubtless promoted by those Jewish Christians, who had occasion to repair to that city on commercial or other business.


Grammarians say, properly signifies recon slain, but is used both in the Classical and $\mathrm{H}+$. lenistic writers in the sense recent. I agric however, with Dr. Blomf. on Aischyl. Chit ; 791. that it is rather to be derived from $x_{0}$ and фdंш, cognate with waives, appareo.

- dıaterayíyat] had issued a íबé rajas or decree.' This is noticed by Suitor. Cia. C. 23. Judzos impulsore Chresto assiduè tui tuantes Romà expulit. This Chrestus is by me-: recent Commentators supposed to have beer Hellenistic Jew ; but by the antient and cart modern ones taken to mean Jesus Christ, who: is the best founded opinion. The tumult question were dissensions between the Jews a: Christians (whether Jewish or Heathen). ar other political disturbances which so might t: moral revolution was sure to promote; in wi: sense Christ might well say he came not to :peace, but a sword. The change of Christ to Chrestus was likely to be made, and, in is we know was made. And Christ might. means of his religion, be said to be the $t=$ pulsar.

3. oкnขoสotol] Few words so plain ba given rise to more debate on the interpretatiThe general opinion, both of antients and it darns, is that it signifies tent-makers. Nil Commentators, however, thinking it too meal: trade for the Apostle of the Gentiles, have vised other interpretations, e. gr. weavers tapestry -makers of mathematical instrument saddlers. But for these significations there very slender authority; and St. Luke, writing a plain style, and upon no subject of art science, must be supposed to use such a w as this in its ordinary sense. And alto Schoettg. remarks, that the question cannot positively settled without a more intimate quaintance with the then modes of life in S: and Asia Minor, yet there can be little do that St. Paul's trade was, as Chrysost. Es: that of a maker of tents, formed of leather thick cloth, both for military and domestic ${ }^{2}$ : poses; the latter having been, from the scar ic of inns, much used throughout the East in tray.. ling, nay in that warm climate, were even u:as houses during the summer season.













4. ixat recent Commentators docebat. There will be no reason to deviate from the usual sense, if we suppose that here, as often, action is put for endeavour, and that weitery must, from the subject, mean 'persuading them to embrace Christianity.' So 2 Cor. v. 11 . dióótes tod фóßon toù Kupiou


 which is preferred by Beng., Pearce, and Kuin., and edited by Griesb., Knapp, and Tittm. ; but, 1 think, without sufficient reason. The external authority for this reading is trifing, and the internal by no means strong. The sense, indeed, 'was occupied in preaching the word', is not amiss, though somewhat frigid. The Vulg. and other Versions help out the sense by rendering 'instabat verbo.' But that would require iveneito, as indeed Markl. conjectured, but for which there is not the least authority. I now cannot help suspecting that this plainer reading has arisen from alteration. Not that it is a gloss, for $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \dot{\operatorname{coj}} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{a} t$ could not thus be explained; but it should seem that the antient Critics (who were but hulf:learned) stumbled at the phrase, and thought juat as we find Bp. Pearce did, and so put down té $\lambda$ órey in the margin, or over té туей priate to dıaдартуро́доvos. Markl., indeed, professes not to understand the common reading. But it may be sufficiently well understood ; nor is it necessary, as Markl. supposes, to take dia-
 regard it as put for кal бıє $\mu$ aptupeto, and render it '[thereby] earnestly maintaining.' The common reading, then, must be retained, and the sense given by Luther, Doddr., and Schleus., is the beit, 'he was incited by a strong impulse of mind :' a signification of $\pi \nu \in \ddot{u} \mu a$ very frequent. Suvéx cotat, indeed, usually means to be hemmed in' $\mathrm{*c}$. But, from the adjunct, it may very well denote to be urged, impelled, \&c. So 1 Cor.
 urges me, will not let me rest, as Chrys. explains. There is a similar idiom at $x x$. 22 .

 posing by words.' This is a military metaphor.
of which Flsn. and Markl. adduce two examples; but there is one more apposite in Thucyd. iil. 83.



 which we may compare what is mentioned in Nehem. v. 13., like shaking the dust off one's shoes at any one, and signifying that we renounce all intercourse. See Note on xiii. 51 . At rd aima \&c. sub. тре́чerau. By at $\mu a$ is meant destruction, i. e. figuratively, perdition in the next world. This manner of speaking was usual both with the Hebrews (see 2Sam. 1. 16. Ezra $\times \times x$ iii. 4.) the Greeks and the Romans. See examples in Elsn. and Wets., who rightly derive it from the very antient custom of putting hands on the heads of victims for sacrifice, and imprecating on them the evils which impended over the sacrificer, or the nation. Ka日apdr,
 words must not be understood as implying abandonment of the Jews, but an especial attention to the Gentiles, by going among them. See Note on xiii. 10 .
5. цetaßas ineitery Not from the house of Aquila, (hus shifting his hadgings) as most Commentators suppose; but from the synagogue, that being, no doubt, the place where the words just before had been pronounced. For the place where the exhortations \&c. were delivered, is
 Besides, if ouyay. be not taken as the substantive of place referred to, there is no other. Then $\bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \in \nu$ els oiniav must be understood to mean 'entered into,' ' entered upon,' for the purpose of teaching and preaching, perhaps in an upper apartment appropriated to that purpose. See a kindred passage at xix. 9. There is no reason to think that Paul shifted his lodgings from the house of Aquila ; which, indeed, as he no doubt continued to uork with him, would have been inconvenient.
 ture of the Imperat. with the Subjunct. is thought to be a Hebraism. There is no pleonasm; for the Subjunct. form is more significant than the Imperative, there being an cllip. of öpa, q.d. Mind that ye be not silent!
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10．той какш̄бal］for els то̀，or ※̈бте как． On 入aós $\dot{\text { era ri }}$ the best Commentators remark that the persons in question are called Christ＇s people by anticipation；just as the Gentiles，who should afterwards embrace the Christian religion， are in Joh．x．16．already called the flock of Christ．

11．ix $\alpha \theta \iota \sigma e ́]$＇took up his abode．＇A Hel－ lenistic use of the word，as in Lu．xxiv． 49.

12．「a入入．$\alpha \nu \theta v \pi$ ．т $\bar{\eta} s^{\prime} A_{X}$ ．］The best Com－ mentators are agreed that the sense is，＇on Gallo becoming Proconsul．＇Kareфiornut is a very rare word，but may be compared with кatext－ Xetpées and others．
 say：＂The Roman people permit no Jews in Greece to worship God after the rites of the Mosaic Law（See Joseph．Ant．xiv．40，xvi． 2. and the Note on Acts xxiv．6．）；but this fellow teaches things contrary to our Law，and excites disturbances among us．＂

14．díí．ni jadiov́ mentators are agreed，that d oik．is equivalent to тарауо́ $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{x}$ ，any capital or serious offence．＇Pad． they define flagitium．It should rather seem to correspond to the minor class of offences with us styled larceny，（Hence indeed the word roguery is derived．See Note on xiii．10．）or even those petty breaches of the peace which with us are called misdemeanours．The jag．movnpin per－ haps had reference to those roguish waggeries not infrequently played off in Heathen countries in ridicule of the Jewish rites and ceremonies， like Alcibiades＇ridicule of the mysteries \＆c．， and such as that which Josephus tells us was committed by a Roman in ridicule of circumei－ sion，and which were always punished，when the
authors could be detected，by the Roman wis－
 you，lend a patient ear to you．＇

15．入óyov каl бvoц．］i．e．of doctrine as： names［of the respective supporters，as of Mc－ and Christ］and of the law which ye hold compared with another newly promulgate：
 Note．

16．$\left.d x \eta^{\prime} \lambda a \sigma e \nu\right]$ i．e．＇bid them be gone；＂$\equiv$ Kin．adduces an example from Xenoph．
17．$\epsilon \pi \iota \lambda \alpha \beta o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o l ~ \delta \dot{~}$ I Render，＂Whereof the Greeks laying hold of＇\＆c．There is． reason to suppose＇E $\mathbf{E} \lambda \eta$ 位s should be cancel＇： By та́ขтes of＂End．are denoted all the Greco namely，both Christians and heathens，of ah the latter as well as the former were incenses： the bitter spirit evinced by the Jews，and w－ glad to take this opportunity of insulting J．： Sosthenes，who seems to have been successu： Crispus，as Ruler of the synagogue，was ti treated as being，no doubt，the spokesman， perhaps the promoter of the persecution． etuxтоע is merely to be understood beating with their fists，probably as he passed throw the crowd out of the Hall of justice．Some ${ }^{2}$ similar occurs in Thucyd．iv． 47.
 Mark vi． 46.
 are not agreed whether this is to be refire． Aquila，or to Paul．Jet all peculiarly di－ guished for knowledge of Greek（as Chi－ （Ecum．，Isid．，Erasm．，Beta，Calvin，and Cans Salmas．，Grot．，Heinsius，Hamm．Iv til Valckn．，Wakef．，Schleus．，Heinr．， $\mathbf{K}$ win．． almost every Editor of the N．T．）have aden
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the former view，which is supported by the antient Versions，and as it involves far more probability， and avoids the difficulties attendant on supposing $P a u l$ to be meant，it deserves the preference． The sense，then，is，after having shorn his head at＇enchrea，＇which was the port where be embarked on his voyage．The Commentators are generally agreed that the vow was not one of Nazarite，but a colum cirile，such as was taken during or after recovery from sickness，or deli－ verance from any peril，or on obtaining any unexpected good，to consecrate and offer up the hair，the sharing of which denoted the fulfil－ ment of the vow．

19．кর̛̣кívous кaré入．aüroü Sic．］The sense is obscurely expressed，but there is no necessity to adopt the expedient proposed by Doddr．，of transposing this clause，and placing it after识入ovтos，v．21．The fact is that Paul had brought them with him，on his voyage to Ca－ sarea，as far as Ephesus，and there put them on shore ；and the ship stopping there a short time， including a sabbath day，Paul took the oppor－ tunity of preaching to the Jews，to whom his discourse was so acceptable，that they pressed him to remain longer with them，which，how－ ever，he was obliged to refuse，because if he permitted the ship to go without him，he should probably not be able to meet with another to convey him in time for the feast at Jerusalem．

21．cooptị̀ roiñ att A Hellenistic phrase． The sense is merely，＇I must spend the feast time．＇$\Delta \in i \quad \mu e$ must be taken populariter，ac－ cording to an idiom of our own language．The Apostle＇s purpose may be imagined to have been to promote the cause of conversion，and the communication between the Christians of Jeru－ salem and of other parts of the world．And hence we may suppose that this feast was the Passuler．

22．duaßas］namely，to Jerusalem，as some of the best Commentators are agreed．This may， indeed，seem a somewhat harsh omission；but as els＇Iepoóó una occurred only a little before，it is not so．To take dvaßais，with some Com－ mentators，of Casarea involves far greater harsh－ ness，since it would exclude all mention of the going to Jerusalem，the great object of Paul＇s voyage into those parts．Katé $\boldsymbol{\beta}_{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ els＇Ave． would not be applicable to Cæsarea，whereas it is to Jerusalem ；for Paul would，no doubt，go by sea，perhaps by Caesarea．

24．a vip גóyios］An expression denoting，in the earlier writers，a man of letters，especially an historian ；but in the later－ones an eloquent man， which is probably the sense here，though some Commentators adopt the first－mentioned signifi－ cation．$\Delta u v a r d s$ èv tais ypaфais，＇well versed in the interpretation of the Scriptures of the $0 . T$ ．＇

25．катクX．тウ̀v ord roüк．）From what fol－ lows it is clear that this must be understood with limitation，namely，as only denoting that part of the Christian doctrine which consisted in repent－ ante and faith in a Messiah to come．＇Axpißcös， carefully，i．e．according to his knowledge，the imperfection of which is suggested by what
 ＇I．must mean，by synecdoche，the whole doctrine and religious system of John．See Matt．xxi． 25. Lu．xx：4．Acts i．22．x．37．Only it should seem to be implied that Apollos had received the baptism of John，though most probably not in person，but from some of his disciples，and even that recently．He had certainly not re－ ceived Christian baptism，as Mr．Scott supposes．

26．Ta jj $\left.\left.\dot{\eta} \sigma!a^{\prime}\right\} e \sigma \theta a c\right]$ This may have reference to his descanting on the necessity of repentance and reformation，and to his pointing out many errors in the usual mode of understanding the Scriptures，especially the Prophecies．
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27．тротреча́мо⿱宀⿻三丨口］This may be reformed either to Apollos，or to the disciples；but the former mode，which is supported by the most eminent Commentators，is preferable．They ex－ horted him to carry into effect so good a reso－ lotion．
－ovveßdi入ero－xápıros］It is plain that ore $\beta$ ．must mean＇contributed to the advantage of．＇But on the sense and construction of $\delta$ sa
 it must not be construed with rois rex．is ma－ nifest，for that would give a very awkward air to the sentence；and no such phrase as жтотev́es on Tins $\chi \alpha^{\alpha} \rho$ ．elsewhere occurs in Scripture．Be－ sides，the sense would be here not very suitable． It must be taken，as almost all the ancient Trans－ lators saw，with avvé $\beta a \lambda$ cero．The question， however，is what is the sense．Beza，Comer．， Raphael，Wets．，Rosenm．，and Heine．，take tins Xd́pıros to mean grace of diction and manner，as in Lu．iv．22．roils 入óyous tins xdpıtos．But that sense would here be scarcely important enough，and this toû $\lambda$ ójou would be indies－ pensable．There can be no doubt that $\tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \mathrm{s}$
 quant，that sometimes toe $\Theta c o u ̄$ is dispensed
 סoOcions．also xii．6．xv．15．and especially Rom．
 votes．Where sou $\Theta$ eoù must be supplied．And
 The interpretation in question is moreover re－
入érхeто．where eúvóvcos may be rendered stre－ nuously，as in Lu．xxiii．10．，and staкaтŋ入． signifies something more than кат $\eta \lambda$ é $\gamma X$ ．，con－ fated．
 inland regions，＇of Phrygia．See my Note on Thucyd．i． 7.
－$\mu \mathrm{cot} \mathrm{\eta ra}$ ］Many recent Commentators think that these were only believers in $a$ Mes－
siah，and followers of John the Baptist．B：： thus they could not have been Christ＇s discip：－ at all．Besides，St．Paul addresses them as his： tired in the name of Jesus，which at least imp that they must have publicly professed faith Jesus Christ．It should seem that the men hit been，some time before，baptized by some John＇s disciples，but had been not long at Ephe： where partly by means of Apollos，and partly Aquila，they became convinced of the truth the Christian religion；though they were ： thoroughly acquainted with its doctrines， had yet been formally baptized．

2．$\alpha \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ out $\left.\delta \ell-\eta \kappa o \dot{v} \sigma a \mu \epsilon \nu\right]$ This，accordinz． the sense assigned by our Common Verso would imply such ignorance as，even on ： supposition that the men were only Johann：： would be incredible．But indeed it is $q$ ？ unnecessary to so interpret；for Grot．， Pearce，and others have proved，that סafowey or $\lambda a \mu \beta a \nu \delta \mu \in \nu o v$ must be supplied at $+\sigma \cdot$
 where our Version very properly expresses ठıóóucvov．In both passages the extraordi： influences of the Holy Spirit must be un stood．The d $\lambda \lambda$ a may be rendered Nay． 1 t men，who probably had lived in some res situation，and had not been long at Ephesus， never heard of the effusion of the Holy Spirit Pentecost．

3．els ti］Sub．Bdжтifua．Bis here， often，does not denote purpose，as most Comm taters suppose ；but els with the Accuse．is pu： iv［by］with a Dative，as in forms of swear e．gr．Matt．v．35．els＇Ieporóvua，which is


4．$\beta \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau$ ．нeтavoias］a baptism which bey those who underwent it to repentance，refer： ton，and purity of life．＇See xiii．24．and $N$ ， Toût＇ Apostle，briefly importing，＇Now that Me：－ whom John bound you to worship is Jesees．

























clout St . Paul proceeded to enlarge on the avidence for the Messiahship of Jesus, the benefits of his religion, and its doctrines.
 of some recent Commentators, 1 must maintain the sense to be, they spake with [foreign] tongues. and used their gift in the exercise of the тоофитєia or inspired teaching and preaching. It is plain that $\gamma^{\lambda \text { ajofans }}$ here is for exipats $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\lambda \text { cai } \sigma a t s, ~ a s ~ i n ~ t h e ~ k i n d r e d ~ p a s s a g e ~ o f ~ A c t s ~ i i . ~} 4$.
 Note. We may observe a climax, трофŋтela



 'obstinately refused to yield credence.' So
 got. See also Pis. xciv. 8. and Hebr. iii. 8. 'A the synagogue and church communion, and preaching elsewhere. See tote on xviii. 7.
10. тavtas] This may be taken, with many Commentators, in a qualified sense; but, in fact, there was such a constant influx of persons to this capital and emporium of Asia Minor, that there could not be many persons but who had heard, at least by the report of others, of the doctriden of Christianity. By 'Aviary is meant
the province of which Ephesus was more immediately the capital, and nearly corresponding to the ancient Ionia.
12. бoudd́pıa] See Lu. xix. 20. Eıцukiv0ia, from the Latin semicinctum, a half-girdle, or garment, equivalent to our apron.
13. Hepiepx., called in Latin circulatores. The persons were something like our travelling mountebanks, and besides skill in medicine, aretended to knowledge of magic. See Note on iv. 7. and Matt. xii. 27.
14. lives] This must be construed with \%xTa, 'some seven persons, sons of Sceva.' See xxxiii. 23. and Thucyd. iii. 11. and vii. 87. The same idiom is found in our own language, and signifies about.
 - 1 recognize the authority of Jesus and Paul, but your's I disavow.' Wets. compares from

 is by a metaphor taken from wild animals, is rare, and not exemplified by the Commentators. I have, however, in Recens. Synop., adduced several examples from Homer. Karaкvp. aïテ̄̈, i $\sigma$.koa' a. Almost all Commentators for the last century are agreed in taking ioxuve lat' aücüy to denote 'exercised force over them by maltreating them,' as in Wisd. xix. 20. But it
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may perhaps be regarded as a seemingly plomastic, yet very significant expression, importing more than either would mean alone. "I $\sigma \chi v \sigma$
 as our popular phrase with the clothes torn off one's back.

18. $\langle\xi о \mu о \lambda$. кal $d \nu a \gamma \gamma$.] The expressions are nearly synonymous, and denote frank and open confession, with a narration of all circumstances. By the т $\rho a \dot{\xi}$ ers are especially meant magical practices, though also implying sins of every kind.
19. ixavol] 'a good many.' Ta mepiepya. The word, as applied to persons, signifies numis sedulus, male curiosus; and hence, as applied to things, supervacuus, varus. Thus it was used to denote the " superstitious vanities" of magic, a sense occurring both in the Scriptural and Classical writers. See many examples adduced in Recens. Synop. The books here mentioned were, no doubt, treatises on magic, as those of Artemidorus, and Astrampsychus on the interpretation of dreams. Ephesus was the chief resort of the professors of the art, who formed what are called in the Classical writers 'Eфé $\quad$ ta $\gamma \rho \alpha{ }^{\prime} \mu \mu a \tau a$, which were scrolls of parchment inscribed with certain formula, and bound to the body, being used as amulets. 'Apyopiov, 'of silver coin,' what, it is impossible to determine. Some say the silver shekel of four drachms; but most think it was the drachm. Still it is not quite certain whether that was the same as the Attic drachm. Wets. adduces several examples of pernicious books being publicly burnt.
20. ката кра́тоs] An adverbial phrase signifying extremely, loxupeis. The word often occurs in Thucyd. "I $\sigma$ Xuev is well explained by Schleus. vim exseruit.
 solved." The best Commentators have bet: long agreed in assigning this sense, in preference to referring the expression to the Holy Spiri: The Article is used in the former sense as well athe latter, of which examples are adduced by Doddr.
 hold to ( $\epsilon \pi \tilde{2}$ ), and 2. to keep to, stay; and has: reflected force by the clip. of éautóy. In the sense of stay it occurs frequently in the bes authors, either without, or (as here) with tit: addition of an Accusative, (depending on agate denoting duration of time.
21. «́pyuооко́тоs] This signifies a evorker in silver, whether a silver-smith, or a manufacture: of silver coins, the Commentators are not agree. The former is the more probable, and is supported by the best Commentators, who suppose: the vagus djpyupous 'Apt. to have been static silver medals of the celebrated Temple of Diana at Ephesus, (which was one of the wonders a; the world, being 425 feet long, 220 broad, ans having 120 columns sixty feet high, of which it were carved, ) or at least of the chapel which contained the famous statue of the Goddess: These were largely bought for curiosity or devoLion, (as the models of the Santa Croce at Lorecto in modern times) and were carried by eravellers or others, whereat to perform their devotions, and by way of safeguard. There cai be little doubt but that the dpyupóxoroe ala executed large coins representing the temple. with the image of Diana; and an example o: this sense is found in Jerem. vi. 29. LXX. The тєXvirat here denote the chief workmen, and the épyátat the inferior artizans employed ot.
atp























these portable chapels. By the tai rosauta a little further on is meant the work bestowed, i. e. statuary, painting, and such sort of matters connected with the Pagan religion. Mapeixero tprafiav, 'paid considerable wages to,' as Acts xvi. 16.
 signification, and is to be interpreted according to circumstances. See supra xi. 29.
22. 门јiv td $\mu$ épos] The sense seems to be, - this our part of the common employment, this our business.' The Dat. is for the Genit. 'A be utterly refuted or rejected. The word is used by Symmachus, and ci $\lambda$ eq ids occurs in the Sept. The construction of this passage is somewhat unusual ; and therefore the passage has been treated as corrupt, and has been tinkered by both antient and modern critics. But, in fact, no change is necessary, since the style is what is called popular, and the constriction is : kay-


23. Ө' $\alpha$ upon] i.e. the place of public resort for every kind of business and pleasure. Evesbi nous, fellow travellers, or, as others explain, townsmen, those who had left their country tonether with Paul.
24. 'Asap $\chi^{\cos }$ ] These Asiarchs were among those annual magistrates, who in the Eastern part
of the Roman Empire, were (like the Roman Addles) superintendents of things pertaining to religious worship, the celebration of the public games \&c. They were called, according to the province over which they presided, either Aliarchs, Lyciarchs, Syriarchs \&c. The office was only for a year, and was elective, a certain number of persons (in Proconsular Asia, ten) being elected by the towns, and sent to form a council at the capital. Of these the Proconsul appointed one to be the Asiarch, the rest, styled Asiarchs, being his colleagues. See more in Rec. Syn.
25. троеßißaбау Alék. троß. т. '1.] At èк той $\bar{\delta} \chi^{\lambda o v}$ sub. тıves. Ipoeßiß. signifies 'they put him forward [as spokesman];' for $\beta_{\imath} \beta a \zeta$ ell and its compounds often implies the latter. So Polyp. xxiv. 3.7. троß. тiva cis dó $\begin{aligned} & \text { nous. See }\end{aligned}$ also Thucyd. iii. 52. fin. Mpoßalóvtmy is best rendered by Kypke, Wets., and Kain. recommending, of which sense they adduce three examples.
 obscurity in the narration, to clear up which Bp; Peace would render Tee irícco "for the people, i. e. to the Magistrates. This, however, ia directly opposed to the usage of the language; and it would be very harsh to suppose so material a circumstance omitted. It is strange that the opinions of Commentators concerning the passage









should have been so various, since the whole admits of satisfactory explanation. 'Amodoyeĩ $\sigma$ Has signifies to pronounce an apology, to speak in exculpation of oneself or of others. Now as this Alexander was set up to speak, and put forward by others, it is not likely that he should have intended to speak in his own behalf. But if in behalf of others, for whom so likely as the Jews, who put him forward? The purpose, doubtless, was to exculpate them from any share in the blame which was imputed to the Christians; that they might not be sacrificed in the destructon which threatened the Christians. And centainly they had reason for fear, from their well known hatred of idol worship; and the bitter animosity in which they were held, is clear from the multitude refusing to hear the orator because he was a Jew. It does not appear that Alexander meant to have made any attack on the Christians.
26. ̇̇т 1 yvóntes]. This, (for the common reading ixtyvóvrosv) is the reading of many of the best MSS., of almost all the early Fd., and of several Fathers; and it is adopted by almost every Editor from Wets. to Vat. And rightly; for besides the strong external evidence, internal evidence is quite in its favour, it being the more difficult reading. It is, however, not so much a Nominative absolute, as it involves an anacoluthen.
27. Karaore $\lambda \lambda_{\infty}$ signifies properly to put down, as Ps.lxv. 8. (Aq.) катабт. тঠ кúтоя $\tau \bar{\eta} \varepsilon \theta a \lambda \alpha \sigma \sigma \eta s$. But it is more frequently used in a metaphorical sense of allaying or quieting a tumult.

- $\gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau e \dot{s}]$ It is easier to mark the rank and duties of this office than to represent the word by any corresponding one of modern languages. He was President of the Senate, and his duties embraced most of those of our Chancellor and Secretary of State, or Speaker of the House of Commons. See my Note on Thucyd. iv. 118. 24. Transl.
-xis $\gamma \alpha^{\prime} \rho$ ed $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ \&cc.] Pearce and Markl. rightly observe, that the $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ has reference to some clause omitted, to be filled up thus: There is no need of this clamorous repetition of "Great" \&ic.] for what man is there \&c.? The omission in such cases may usually be traced, as here, to violent emotion, hurry, or such like. Newкópod. The word at first denoted a sweeper of the temple. Afterwards, however, from the humility of relygious devotees, it was employed to denote a curator, or one whose office it was to see that the temple was kept in good repair, neat, clean, and furnished with every thing proper for the celebration of worship. Moreover, what was pro-
pertly applicable only to a person, was transfers. by Prosopoperia, to cities, especially as it it usual to personify them. And thus by and commodation of the sense, it came to sir: devoted, consecrated to, and was used in referee-: to the tutelary Deities of a city. This tempi not confined to Ephesus, but extended wo oc: cities of Greece, and Asia Minor. Sometin one and the same city was called vewinopos $x:$ respect to three or even four different Gods. I.
 Syriac. The Commentators remark that inmate of antiquity so remote as to ascend beyond 2 historical record were feigned by the priershave come from Heaven. This might have tor: the case as far as regards the material, at lear: the first images of Gods, since aerolites of itmenses size, and most grotesque shapes. a? known in all ages to have fallen from the in. One or two of these might, in the infancy idolatry, (bearing, by a lupus nature, a i: resemblance to the human bust) have been: gadded as images of Gods, and as coming ts the skies, sent from heaven to be worship pr Afterwards, similar aerolites, not natures shaped like a bust, would be so formed br: Such, I doubt not, were the far-famed Pall of Troy and of Athens. Sometimes, however. a rude state of society, the aerolite was left in natural state. Of these we have at least $t$ examples, in an image of black stone in $t$. Temple of the Sun described by Herodian 1. v. and the famous black stone in the Kaaba at Med which there is reason to think has been an o ject of worship from the earliest ages.

Өeâs before 'Aprépióos is omitted in sere: MSS. and Versions, and cancelled by Griesi Knapp, and Tittm., perhaps rightly.
36. кateoraluévous] quiet and order:?
 pitate,' is an euphemism not uncommon in Classical writers. See Note on 2 Tim. iii. 2.
 to a sentence omitted, q.d. [And that you $n$ : been hasty and rash is certain,] for you hiv brought hither \&c.

- $\theta \epsilon \delta \nu$ ] Such, for the common reading $\theta_{t}$ is read in many MSS., nearly all the early Fid and some Fathers; and it is preferred by $M_{1}$ and adopted by Wets., Math., Griesb., Titty, and Vat. It is also confirmed by internal tex mong; for the scribes were far more likely change $\theta a d \nu$ into $\theta \epsilon a \nu$ than the contrary. appears from this, that some who had oed il their archetypes changed riv into Tojo, whir Griesb., by a grievous blunder, has edited.
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38．入óyov］Some take this to mean a case at law；but others，more agreeably to the simple style of St．Luke，interpret it a complaint，by an clip．of $\mu \circ \mu \phi \bar{\eta}$ ，like the Heb． 727 in Exod． xviii．16．So Col．iii．13．éàv res Tide viva eX！ ноиф riv．At infra xxiv．19，and Matt．v．23．we
 ＇court days［appointed for trying causes］．＇ Hesych．explains dyopaiar by dixacoloyiav． ＂Ayouras，are holden，i．e．appointed to be holden．
－autízaroc］The only satisfactory way of accounting for the plural is to regard it not so much as an hyperbole，but as a popular idiom，by which the plural is put for the singular in a generic sense，q．d．It is for laws and pro－ consuls to decide such matters．＇I would com－ pare Issus p．51，3．oügon duccov，＇though there was a power of seeking justice．＇＇Eyкa入eitwoav $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \lambda_{j} \lambda$ ．The sense is，＂let them go to law（ix $\gamma$－ $\kappa \lambda \eta \sigma \iota y$ eloayétwoav）against each other．＇It is a forensic term．
 cen，whether political or religious．For maple ¿Típesy 10 MSS．，some very ancient，have manat－ ripon，which was undoubtedly read by the ancient Syriac translator．It is likewise found in the very antient Italia，and was probably read by the Vulg．：for alterius there seems to be an error of the scribes for ulterius．So elegant a term as Tepatrépos was sure to be roughly handled by the scribes，especially as $\tau t$ preceded，and $e$ and al are，by Itacism，continually interchanged． In confirmation of this reading see the passages
adduced in my Note on Thucyd．iii．81．（Transl． and Ed．）e．gr．Eschyl．P．V． 255 ．M троíßクs vaivode val тepactipoo．Among other antient MSS．，this is contained in B and E．，and most probably in $D$ ，one of the most antient and valuable MSS．in existence．Besides，repast $\rho$ ， as Rinck shews，is far more suitable in sense．
 for the Art．is not pleonastic，but the regular assembly；＇a pointed way of hinting that the present assembly was not such．

40．кınojvev́opev］The second person is deli－
 in the law sense，denoted not only sedition，but tumult，and is further explained by the ouropo－ $\phi \bar{\eta} \mathrm{s}$ following，which signifies a tumultuous as－ semblage，for which छúataбıs is sometimes used．
XX．3．rourfas］A noun absolute，or rather
 drispou入ri，as a verbal，takes the construction of the verb from which it is derived．On the plot in question Commentators variously speculate． It was probably one to contrive means to make away with Paul while on the voyage．At dy＇－ veto $\gamma \nu \cos ^{\prime} \mu$ repeat av่тc̣，from the preceding， It was his purpose．＇
 for the Jews used their festivals in the same way as we do，when we say Christmastime or Mi－ chaelmas－time．＂Apis $\dot{1} \mu$. ． $\boldsymbol{\pi} .{ }^{\prime}$＇within five days．＇ This use of the word is Hellenistic，and found also at Rom．viii．22．xi．25．Hebr．iii． 13.

－Th mat．］About 17 MSS．and several
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Versions have $\dot{\eta} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$, which is preferred by Grot., Mill, and Beng., and edited by Griesb., Knapp, Tittm., and Vat. But without sufficient reason. See Wets, and Matth. The zoü is omitted in many MSS. and almost all the early Edd., and is cancelled by Matth. and Griesb. It may have come from the margin. On the thing itself see ii. 42.
8. See Note on Joh. vi. 10.
9. $\tau$ is Bupidos] 'the window;' which, it seems, was a kind of lattice, or casement, admitting of being thrown back, so as to let air into the apartment, heated by so much company and so many lamps. Катаферо́ценоs üжעч, for els or moos Üxyoy, of which latter construction examples are adduced by the Commentators. The former is Hellenistic, but occurs in Parthen.
 Commentators closely connect the кaтaф. with $\ddot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \nu$, taking it to mean only $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \in \sigma \epsilon \nu$ кá $\tau \omega$. But the latter may denote the completion of the action described as in progress in кataфep. And so, I find, it was taken by Budmus in his Lexicon, who renders ' victus somno.' The $\dot{\alpha} \pi \delta$ d is for $\dot{v} \pi \delta$; or rather it may be rendered, 'from the effects of sleep.'

- Tpıoтérou] ' the third story;' for oréyos signifies not only a reof, but the flooring of an upper apartment, as being a roof to the apartment below. So the Latin tristega tecta, the third floor. And Juvenal iii. 199. Tabulata tecta. - $\ddot{\eta} \rho \theta_{\eta} \nu \in \kappa \rho \delta_{s}$ ] Many recent Commentators, from 1 Bp . Pearce suppose the word to mean 'was taken for dead.' They urge that persons falling from a high place are often found in a swoon; and that there is nothing in the context that would lead us to think the lad was dead. Nay that Paul himself says ' he is not dead.' The first argument, however, has no force against the plain words of St. Luke. And the second and third have next to none. There is no trait in the A postles and Evangelists more remarkable than their avoiding every thing like setting off any
circumstance to the utmost. Again, it by po means follows from St. Paul's stretching himself upon the young man that he thought him alive. or meant to see whether he was so or not. The Apostle by doing the very thing which Elijah in similar circumstances did, evidently regarded him as dead, and, no doubt, imitated the Prophet in offering up fervent prayer that he might be brought to life. And as to the expression of St.
 infer from that that the young man was not dead, than in the narration at Matth. ix. 14, from the words où $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{d} \pi \dot{e} \theta a v \epsilon$, that the damsel was not dead. See the Note there. In this very light Chrysost. viewed the matter, whom see in Rec. Syn.
 very rare in the Classical writers, though one example from Plutarch is adduced by Wets.

11. oütcos $\dot{\varepsilon} \xi \bar{\eta} \lambda \theta \epsilon \nu]$ 'then he departed.' So the Syr. and some of the best modern Commentators.
12. "Hyarov] for clotr; The sense seems to be 'they had brought in,' probably before the Apostles departed. Z Z̄̄итa,' 'alive and well. So Joh. iv. 50. vios $\sigma 00$ そ̌̃.

- ov $\mu e \tau \rho i=0$ ] Of this phrase (in which there is a meiosis) the Commentators adduce several examples.

13. $\mu \AA \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \pi \in$ Чevéctu] On his reason for thithe Commentators variously speculate. I amm stil of opinion, that the reason was what I have supposed in Recens. Synop., i.e. to avoid the tediou: irksome, and dangerous circumnavigation of the promontory of Lectrum, which extends a louway into the sea, insomuch that the distance from Troas to Assos is about one-third shorter b, land than by sea. Mȩ̧úev should not be ren dered 'to go on foot,' but 'to go by land,' aoften in the best writers. And so $\pi \in \zeta \bar{y}$, by lanat occurs in Matt. xiv. 13. and Mark vi. 3 .
 'off.'
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14. Tours т $\rho \in \sigma \beta u \tau$ épous] As these persons are at v.28. called غтьбкóтоus, and especially from a comparison of other passages, as 1 Tim. iii. 1, the best Commentators, antient and modern, have with reason inferred that the two were not yet distinct orders. The term dлібкожоя might denote either an overlooker, or a caretaker; and these senses would be very suitable to express the pastoral duties. But the word might also, correspondently to the Hebr. פק, denote a ruler, or governor, an idea naturally arising out of the former. The term xpeaßírepos was borrowed from the Jewish Hierarchy, and correspondent to the $\quad$ arp, or Archisynagogi of the Jews. Now all mpeaßúrepot were officially $d \pi i$ oкото. Yet we are not therefore to infer that there was no superintending supreme authority in the primitive Church; for reason will show that no society can exist without some laws, and consequently persons to administer those laws. There can, then, be no doubt but that one of the presbyters, as there were many at Ephesus, was, in such a case, invested with authority over the others, and consequently was a Bishop in the modern sense of the term. And since, after Fipiscopacy, in that sense, was established, it became proper to have a name by which to designate the ruling Presbyter, none seemed so proper as extionoros, because it was far better fitted to denote the Episcopal than the Pastoral duties, and $\pi \rho e \sigma \beta$. had. no doubt, been always more in use. It was therefore set apart in future to express that. See more in Recons. Synop. vol. v. p. 31 .

Markl. rightly infers from v. 25. that St. Paul convoked not only the Presbyters of F.phesus, but of the district, (namely Asia proper, the antient Ionia) the Christians of all which constituted the Church of Ephesus. St. Paul sent
to those at Ephesus, and they, no doubt, to the other cities where there were presbyters, being scarcely any of them more than a day's journey from Ephesus.
 'How I have conducted myself (i.e. among) you.'
19. סои入єúcon-татеєขоф.] 'discharging the ministry of the Lord with all humility and modesty.' The $\mu$ era' must be repeated at $\delta a \kappa \rho u ́ r o \nu$. and rendered, with a small accommodation of the sense, amidst, or amongst. So the Heb. ב, by. ak. каl тeip., "tribulations and trials.' $\sum_{v \mu \beta \text {. } i v \text {, ' which happened through or by.' A }}$ Classical writer would have used $\delta$ as or $\pi \in \rho i$. See my Note on Thucyd. ii. 70. N. 3.
 in the Middle form, 'to withdraw oneself through fear;' and, in a deponent sense, 'to withdraw. keep back any thing.' Of this sense with oivièv and $\mu \eta \dot{\circ} \dot{\nu} \nu$ the Commentators adduce many exapples. In $\alpha \nu a \gamma \gamma \in i \lambda a t$ cai $\delta, \delta a i \xi a t$ there seems to be a reference to the Gospel preached being at once a message and instruction. Kat oinous. It is plain from the foregoing term in uorír, that this must mean not 'from house to house, but 'in private houses,' (the sari only denoting rotation) namely, those where separate parts of the whole number of Christians met. So at' oinoy supra ii. 46. where see Note. Dnرoaia may allude to the synagogue, or to some place where there was an assembly, as far as was possidle, of the whole church.
 talons take $\pi \nu c i \prime \mu$. to mean the Holy Spirit. But thus derienévos admits of no satisfactory sense, and the next clause discountenances this interpretation. It is better, with others, to take rye ip. of the mind of St. Paul; a very frequent
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sense of the word. $\Delta \in \delta \epsilon \mu \in \mathfrak{y}$ os is well explained by Rosenm., Kuin., and Middl., ' under a strong impulse of my mind;' by a metaphor very similar
 where see Note. Euvavtígovra, what shall occur or happen; as Eccl. ii. 14. ix. 11. Sept.
 one thing [alone I know] that.' So Soph. El.
 тє́么те1 $\mu \in$ \&c. The ëv is supplied by Aristoph. Pac. 227. See Hoogev. de part. in voc. Td тиеїца id äztov is rightly taken by the best Commentators from Hamm. downward to denote persons endued by the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit in every city testified by the mouth of inspared prophets. See xxi. $4 \& 11$. Mévovat, ' await me.' This seems to be a Latinism ; for the sense is frequent in maneo, though rare in بévis.
 account of,' care not for any thing.' An idiom occurring in the best writers. Not so the phraseology of the next clause, which is in the popular style; and ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{X} \sim 0$ is employed according to the Latin use of habeo. Markl. and Kuin. think there is an clip. of oüros, which is expressed in a similar passage of Liban. p. 407, cited by Wets.

 In te入etciogat $\tau \delta \nu \delta \rho o \mu o \nu$ there is an agonistic metaphor. Though this, and many such occurring in the Apostle's writings, may have been no more than the current phrases of the day amongst
 in two senses adapted to the two different clauses to which it belongs. $\Delta \iota a \mu a \rho \tau \dot{\rho} \rho a \sigma \theta a \_-\theta \in o \bar{u}$ is exegetical of д̀anoviav.
25. too vi The sense of the expression here, as
 $\pi \cdot \mu$. As it is next to certain that the Apostle did again visit Proconsular Asia, after his release from imprisonment at Rome, the Commentators are at a loss to reconcile this to facts. And they suppose, either that all the Presbyters now gresent were dead when St. Paul again visited Asia; or that he might mean he should not see them all again. Those solutions, however, are
alike strained, and unnecessary, since we bar o only to suppose that the Apostle here sprit. \& $\nu$. गevépart, according to his human spin: $i^{*}$ mind, and therefore (as he said just before l ar eldcois, not certainly knowing that it would be is but presaging such from the threatening introstons he had received. Indeed the form oil it. or even cv otto' out, is perpetually used in tobest writers to denote something far short at certain knowledge, and only of opinion, and $p^{n}$. sent persuasion. See my Note on Thucyd. iii. 34
26. кaөajds \&c.] See Note on xviii. 9 .
 ly any passage of the N.T. on which the op nions of Critics have been more divided than of this. For a full statement of the various col: tons of the difficulty, see Recens. Synop. i ascertaining the true reading, as preparator to determining the sense, we find the Ms fluctuating between no less than six reading-
 кидiou Өeoù ; toú Өeoú cal кирiou; той keri cal $\theta \in o \bar{u}$. The relative merits of these are dicussed by Wets., Griesb., and Kuin., wt decide in favour of tout cupíoy. Their decision however, ought not to be received as final, si: their statements are occasionally incorrect. at: characterized throughout by an air of unfairness In short, they do not hold the Critical scale: true, acting more like eager advocates than:partial judges. And, not content with other guments, (strong or weak) they press event til argumentum ad verecundiam, which surely least of all be here applicable, since so far fro "all the most eminent Critics" agreeing adopting nupiov, it is rejected by Mill, Ben: Wolf, Venema, Michaelis, Ernesti, Valckna Wassenburg, Matthei, Wakef., Titty., Vat Middle., Gratz, Rinck, Hales, Pye Smith, a: others, almost all of whom retain the comma reading tout $\theta \in o \bar{v}$, though some prefer toū h: pion cal $\Theta \in o v$. . There can be no doubt that $t:$ truth lies among the three readings, tow $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\boldsymbol{c}}$ тoû Kupiuv; and toù Өeoù cal Kupiov. " the other three one is in favour of Kupiov, one:1 tout $\Theta \epsilon o \hat{u}$, and one of toû Kupiou cal $\Theta_{\text {coin. }} 11$ advert to the external evidence in favour of $\tau \in 1$










Kupiou, it is supported by 13 MSS., 5 of them very antient, and the rest neither antient nor very valuable; as also by the Coptic, Sahidic, and Armenian Versions, and some Fathers,
 ported by one very antient and 63 other MSS., none of much antiquity or consequence, but of different families; also by the Slavonic Version, the Ed. Princ., and Plantin. 3. Toù $\theta \in o \bar{u}$ is supported by the most antient, venerable, and generally correct of MSS., the Cod. Vat., and 17 others, some of the $10 t h$, 11 th, or 12 th Centuries, but most of them more modern; also ly the Old Suriac in Professor Lee's MSS. and others in the Vatican; by the Latin Vulgate and, according to some, the Xthiopic. Finally, it is quoted, or referred to, by Ignat., Tertull., Athanasius, Basil, Chrysost., Epiph., Ambrose, Theophyl., EEcumen., and 12 other Fathers of the Greek and Latin Church. Now it is manifest that roü Kupiov is greatly inferior in external authority to either of the two others. Of these two. the evidence of MSS. is in favour of roù Kupiou kal $\theta \in o u ̈$; but that of Versions and Futhers almost entirely in favour of toū $\theta \in o \bar{u}$. To the above statement I would add, that Rinck has lately collated some very valuable MSS. at Venice, of which one contains noü $\theta e o u ̈, ~ t u v ~$ toū. Kupíou kal Beoù, and one toū Kupíou Oeoù. Thus the external evidence for toü $\theta$ eoù is perhaps nearly equal to that for cou Kupiou кal $\Theta$ eoũ ; but, in internal evidence, it is certainly superior ; and, as to toù Kupiou, comparison is out of the question. See the strong arguments adduced by the phalanx of Critics alove mentioned. Suffice it here to remark, 1. that inxגngia toù $\theta \in o \bar{u}$ is quite agreeable to the phraseology of St. Paul, (of whose speeches St. Luke seems to have been a most faithful recorder) since it occurs eleren times in his Epis-
 uhere in the N.T. 2. If St. Luke wrote $\theta$ eov̄, the readinge Kupiov and Xpıotoù may easily be accounted for as corrections; not, however, of the Orthodon, but of the Heterodor! nay, even of some injudicious or hot-headed persons, (as Origen and Nestorius) who stumbled at the uncommonness of the expression "the bloed of God." Whereas if $K$ ypiou had been written by St. Luke, it is, on various accounts, imposible to conceive how it should have been altered to Oecū. On the other hand, the Arians had every reason to alter $\theta$ eov, which they could not retain and continue Arians.

Upon the whole, there can be no doubt but
that $\theta$ eô $u$ was written by St. Luke. But whether toú Kupiou kai did, or did not, precede, I would not be quite positive. Matthei and Vat. so edit ; and lip. Middl. (as well as Ernesti, Michaelis, and Valckn.) seems inclined to prefer it, and has proved, beyond doubt, that "even thus the Divinity of Christ will be equally expressed, because the $K u p i o v$ and $\Theta$ eoù must be understood of one and the same person, of ' Him who is both Lord and Giod.'" let I am inclined to think that $K$ volou being first substituted by the Arians and others for $\boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{e} \boldsymbol{u}$, and having. therefore, crept into the text, or occupied the margins of many MSS., was afterwards unwarily adopted into the text, even by Orthodox librarii, especially as it seemed to soften an apparent harshness. In the above reading, therefore, I must (with Tittm.) finally acquiesce, and have edited accordingly; though 1 have inserted the words $K$ upiou кai in small characters, and within single brackets, as possibly from St. Luke.
 fies 'to make one's own by purchase.' See Dreig. de V. A. p. 378. and Winer's Gr. Gr. \$32.2. The term was often used of acquiring a right to any one's services by preserving or sparing his life in war. See Herodot. i. 110. Wets. compares Dionys. Hal. iv. 11. ท̈v (scil.

30. ठıєбтраццєंעа] 'erroneous.' A metaphor taken from winding paths, or from crooked limbs. So Arrian opposes $\delta \dot{\sigma} \gamma \mu a \tau a \dot{\delta} \rho \theta \dot{a}$ and $\delta \iota є \sigma \tau p a \mu$ нéva каl $\sigma$ т ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\beta} \beta \lambda a$.
 тìs $\chi^{\alpha} \rho$. may, with several eminent lnterpreters, antient and modern, be taken, by a Hebraikm, for the grace itself, per Hendiadym. And thus $\delta v \nu a \mu \epsilon \nu \varphi$ would be referred to God.
 better iaken (with Pisc., Wolf, Heinr., Kuin., the Syr., Arab., and our Common Vension) to mean the Guspel and its doctrines, which can edify men sc. See 2 Tim. iii. 13. Eph. ii. 20.
 refer to the gradual edification of the Gospel, as building* are gradually raised by the architect. The metaphor in $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho o \nu o \mu i a$ is meant to suggest the certainty of the rewards laid $u p$ in heaven for the righteous. Tois riytarmivoos perhaps does not (as most Commentators imagine) here and at xxvi. 18. and Hebr. x. 14. denote Christians, but 'those who have walked worthy of their high calling in haptisn.'
 xvi. 15.
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34．ai $\chi$ eipes aïтat］＇these hands，＇holding them up．There is a similar beauty in $\times x y$ ． 29．$\pi a \rho \epsilon \kappa \tau \delta \varepsilon \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon \sigma \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$ тои́ $\tau \infty \nu$ ．The Com－ mentators compare several passages of the Clas－ sical writers scarcely any much to the purpose． I have，however，in Recens．Synop．，adduced a very apposite one（indeed imitated from the pre－ sent）in Philostrat．Vit．Ap．ii．26．कo八入 $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ d $\delta$

 may be taken as a Dat．commodi，or regarded as a popular negligence of style for $\tau \omega \bar{\omega} \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ $\mu \in \tau^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \mu \mathbf{u}$.

 kindred passage of Joh．xiii．15：There seems alio to be a sensus pragnaus，the notion of teach－ ing being connected with setting an example．
－$\mu a \kappa \dot{\rho} \rho o ́ \nu-\lambda a \mu \beta a \nu \epsilon เ \nu]$ One of the sayings of our Lord unrecorded in the Gospels（see Joh． xxi．fin．）such as，no doubt，there were many circulated among the primitive Christians，and some of which are recorded by the early Fathers； on which see Fabric．Cod．Apoc．N．T．3．131．， and especially the very scarce tract of koermer de Sermonibus Christi $\alpha \gamma \rho \alpha ́ \phi o t s$, Lips． 1770. 8 vo．With the sentiment the Commentators compare many from the Classical writers；and others may be seen in my Note on Thucyd．ii．
 cápoov signifies＇magis juvut＇，it is more happy， attended with a greater blessing．
 to an Oriental custom still retained in the East． See Recens．Synop．
 is a similar passage in Thucyd．i．137．2．，where see my Notes in Transl．\＆FA．
3．divaфavénres $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \mathrm{K}$ ．${ }^{1}$ So the textur re－ reptus，as well as the Ed．Princ．，and almost all
the MSS．The Stephanic reading draquar－ was taken from the Erasmian Fditions，in E ： it was probably only a typosraphical ：－ though possibly one commitied by the sat－ the MS．from which Erasmus＇s first Editio： formed，and inadvertently left uncorrectes the Fditor．Stephens and Beza conjet aंvaф ${ }^{2} \nu a \nu \tau e s$, which would make it come． Grammar，and perhaps in idiom，since крúxтelv тìv $\gamma \bar{\eta} \nu$ is so used．See the exar adduced by me in Recens．Synop．and Thucyd．v． 65 ．And so the Latin idiom $u_{c}$ terram，to make land，or a coast，as we Yet very different is the idiom here adopteci existence of which is attested by the pisio which the Commentators have cited，$t$ ． Theophan．p．392．àaфаиevtron dé aitair $\gamma \bar{\eta} \nu$ ．The best Commentators regard this：－ nautical idion for ávaфaveíons t⿹̄龴s Kir． There is indeed a sort of hypallage，divep．
 $\dot{\eta} \mathrm{K}$ ．There is，indeed，an ellip．of катс， we may render literally，＇being brough： view of Cyprus．＇，So the Vulg．＇quum aft ruissemus Cypro．＇
— каталıто́дтєs aüтì єúcóv．］＇leaving i： the left．＇Of this idiom examples are add：i by Wets．Perhaps there is an ellip．of sara．
 literally，＇was unloading；＇though in reai＇ （by an interchange of past with present，to note what is intended and soon to happen）it： nifies＇was soon to unload．＇See Win．Gr． § 396．C．This ship，and that mentioned xxvi．2．seem to have been in the carrying irs loading goods at one place，and carrying th： to another．
4．toùs $\mu a 0 \eta \tau \alpha$ s＇］＇the disciples，＇i．e．su－ persons as were disciples．There is no nere sity to omit the Article，as Bp．Middl．suppoci
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[^18]8．$\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \lambda \theta \dot{u} u \tau \epsilon-\epsilon i s \mathrm{~K}$ ．］It is not quite cer－ tain，whether they went by sea，or by land；and Commentators are divided in opinion．Now $\dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \lambda \theta$ ．can only mean departing，and that is more suitable to going by land than by sea． There can be little doubt but that they went by land ；the ship，it seems，stopping at Ptolemais longer than they could stay．Beaides，the land journey to Cswarea was more convenient than that by sea，which must have been tedious and dangerous on account of doubling the formidable promontory of Nount Carmel．That they left their companions of the ship，is clear by the qualifying clause oi xepl tov Havinov，which recent Editors have，in their risdom，cancelled， on the authority of some Manuscripts and Ver－ sions．
－\＄ı入．roû evarүe入ı $\sigma$ тoū］Sec viii． 40.
9．трофŋтеúovalat＇endowed with the faculty of speaking or preaching under divine inspira－ tion．＇See ii． 18.

11．ijas тiv Yょivnv \＆c．eixe］Thus follow－ ing the custom of the Prophets of the O．T．，who， in order to impres more strongly on men＇s minds the things which they had to communi－ cate（whether predictions，or declarations），used to employ some corresponding external sign symbolical of the thing．See Jerem．xiii．1．xxvii． 2．seqq．xxxviii．10．A 11 ． 1 Kings $x$ xii．11．Ez． iv．l－13．See also v． 11 \＆ 12 ．Hos．i．2．seqq． （Grot．\＆Wets．）It was not，however，confined to the Prophets；for the employment of symbolical actions was a custom generally prevalent in the early ages，both among the Jews and the Gen－ tiles．Thus Polycrates dedicated Rhenea to Delos by attaching it to that island by a chain． See Thucyd．iii． 104.











 （ial．1． 19.



12．oi èvтóntoc］＇the inhabitants of the place，＇ i．e．（with the limitation suggested by the cir－ cumstances of the case）the Christians of Cesa－ rea．The word is properly synonymous with ciryevis，＇a native of any place；＇but it was，by the later writers，used for é $\gamma \chi$ wopos，an inha－ bitant of a place．Yet the antiquity of that sig－ nification is plain from Soph．Wd．Col．841． cited by the Commentators：$\pi \rho \circ \beta \bar{\alpha} \theta^{\prime} \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \epsilon, \beta \bar{\alpha} \tau$ ，


13．ti roceitc］This is regarded by Markl． as a popular form，for $\tau i ́$ ßoú $\boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \theta e$ ；and Kuin． observes，that verbs denoting action often indi－ cate，not the effect of the action，but only the endeavour，intent，and will．But rí wo九eite is not，as Kuin．fancies，pleonastic．As to the idiom，it is found even in our own language． In $\sigma u \Delta$ ри́ктоитеs the $\sigma u \nu$ has an intensive force， as in $\sigma \cup \nu \tau \rho i(\beta \in \iota \nu, \sigma \cup \gamma \kappa \lambda \bar{\alpha} \nu, \sigma \cup \nu \tau \eta i \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$, \＆cc．，and denotes utter destruction of a thing by its being crushed together，and thus broken up．Pricæus compares many passages of the Classical writers． It is strange he should have forgotten to adduce the＂Quid me querelis exanimas tuis＂of Horace． The sense of к入aiovтes кal ovvO．is＇by weep－ ing and［thus］quite breaking my heart，＇i．e． subduing my courage．Thus the $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ in the following sentence will have great propriety，q．d． For courage I have，being ready，\＆c．In etof－ $\mu \omega \mathrm{E}$ éxu we have an example of that use of é ${ }^{10}$ by which it is so joined with an adverb，as to form a phrase equivalent to eipc and the ad－ jective corresponding to that adverb．

15．aंтобкєvaбápevot］There has here been no little debate as to the reading．The MSS． fluctuate between $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \boldsymbol{0} \boldsymbol{\sigma \kappa}$ ．，éxıбк．，xарабк．，and
 glosses of the preceding．＇Entoкevar．is found in several good MSS．and early Edd．，as also in Chrysost．，Theophyl．，and CEcum．，and is pre－ ferred by Grot．，Pric．，Mill，Markl．，Wets．， Valckn．，and Kuin．and is edited by Beng．， Matth．，Tittm．，and Vat．But without sufficient reason．They object，indeed，to $\alpha \pi \sigma \sigma \kappa$ ．，that the word can only signify to unpack luggage． Whereas the rontext requires the sense to collect one＇s baggage for a journey，which \＆̇ıテкєuá̧c $\sigma$－

Oat does express，being of frequent occurrence in the best writers．This is very true．But hew then are we to account for the alteration of the ordinary term értak．into what has been thought
 1 conceive，will go far to prove，that the new reading is a mere gloss，and the old reading the true one．It ought not to be rejected on the ground that it yields a sense unsuitable；for i ： were surely too bold and hypercritical to set limits to the significations of certain Greek word： And as drooreuri both in the Sept．and the Clas－ sical writers often denotes baggage，（see Steph． Thes．and Schleus．Lex．V．T．）why should no： diтобкєuáそeनөal mean to pack up one＇s bagguzt． just as from dinookeuri in the sense exonernt．． alci，we have the verb drookevá $a \sigma \theta a s$ to six－ nify esonerare alvum，xóбat？In fact，an ex－ ample has been adduced by Palairet from Dionrs．
 oi фєú
 To which I would add Polyb．iv．81，11．тغ cix
 shown unusual discretion by retaining the cosc－ mon reading；perhaps because Matthai rejeets it．

16．ajontes тар ※ं छevor．M．\＆c．］There is here some doubt as to the construction．Byc． Wolf，and others recognize an Attic syntax．ti： which the noun is attracted to the case of th： relative．Thus Mváowvt will be for Muricere： This，however，involves some improbability，as the Attic syntax is not in place in the simpis style of St．Lake．It is better（with Grot．，Hon： herg，Pearce，Doddr．，Rosenm．，Heinr．，ar Kuin．）to regard a yovtes as a brief and Hebras
 бuıvá тLLa，тap＇© $\xi \in \nu \iota \sigma \theta \hat{\omega} \mu \in \nu$ ，and suppo－ that the Dative is put after $\alpha^{\prime} \gamma o v$ res，just as in Hebr．ל often corresponds to an Accus．wil． трós．See Gen．xxiv． 54.

18．＇Iákwßov］Peter and John were bot absent，and James（son of Alphæus；see xv．13． is supposed to have presided both in his Apn stolical character，and as Bishop of Jerustalem at the meeting now held to consider of the bu－ ness which regarder Paul．
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 formed concerning thee.' This term Fabric. on Sext. Emp. $285 * 339$. has shown to be equivalent to 'auditione el famd percipere.' See Note on xviii. 25.
22. tí oüv éatt;] This (as in 1 Cor. xiv. 15 \& 26.) seems to be popular formula, similar to our 'uhut then! i.e. what then [is to be clone] ; and we must supply трактéov. Markl. compares " quid ergo est?" and quid igitur est ? in Cicero and Livy. So that it may be a Iatin1 sm ; for I am not aware that it ever occurs in the Greek Classical writers. As to the paseage
 $\nu \eta r a t$, it is not quite to the purpose. More so is the formula tioùn; which sometimes occurs in the Philosophers, and of which Kypke cites examples from Arrian on Epict.
 and Grot. understand this of a regular convocation of the people, as opposed to the Presbyters. But à Lapide, Pricaus, and all the best recent Commentators, seem right in determining the sense to be, ' It is unavoidable but that the multitude should fock together;' which is quite asreeable to what follows. Deî, like divaran่, often denotes only what must and will happen.
23. roüto oüv тоiñov] The best Commentators, antient and modern, are agreed that this is to be regarded as the language of adrice, not of authoritative command. Buxin. The Commentators are not agreed whether this was a rotum cirile, undertaken on account of recovery from sickness, or deliverance from calamity, or a wow of Nasariteship. The latter is the more probable opinion, since the term ajviseofat which follows is appropriate thereto. See Numb. vi.
 abstinence and purity enjoined by the vow,' and pay their expenses for them, namely, the expenses of the sacrifice on going to the temple for the purpose of being released from the vow by shaving the head. From what has been adduced by Wets., Wits., and Lardner, it appears that this participation in the diyveia did not necessarily make the person a Nazarite; and also that to so participate with and pay the expenses of Nazarites, was not unusual among the Jews, and was regarded as a mark of great piety.

- rycial ] Many good MSS. read $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{2}$ áनouras, which is countenanced by some Versions, and is edited by Griesb. and Tittm. But it seems to have arisen ex emendations. Eroixeîs $\phi$ vidoomv rov עómov signifies 'that thou livest in the habitual observance of the law ;' Vroixein, like repimateiv and the Hebr. הלד, being used of habitual action.

25. xepl dè twn тex. \&c.] The ds is adversative, and the sense is, ' Bui as to the Gentiles, the case is different, and we have ordered, [thus] determining that' \&c.
26. $\alpha \gamma y$, $\sigma \theta e i s$ ] 'performing the injunctions of the vow.'
 notice [to the Priests] of the [period of the] completion of the days of purification;' which the persons themselves, it seems, had not been able to do, because they could not provide the offering. The period, as it appears from what follows, was that din ueek. Fvery one, it seems, was allowed to fix the period of his votive purification, either when he commenced it, or at any time during its courne; so that the Priests had proper notice in order to make the necessary arrangements as to the victims \&xc. "Ecos oṽ, 'at which;' as in Lu. xv. 8. xxii. 16 \& 18. Joh. ix.
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 See Eph．v． 2.
 had not been before mentioned，this must be put
 avyacivoun．So Demosth．cited by Schleus．Lex．


28．Boŋ日eite］The sense is，＇Come to our aid ［in apprehending this person］．＇A sense of the word very frequently occurring in Thucyd．and
 for＂Edגqua．This use，however，of the plural is found in the best writers．See Math．xxvii． 44．and Note．
29．троссорако́тes］The to is not found in very many good MSS．，several Versions，and some Fathers，as also all the early Eld．except the Erasmian，and is cancelled by Beng．and Math．Perhaps the x oo arose from the rap preceding，combined with the $\epsilon$ following．

30．ouvdoouiे］The word is generally used of riotous assemblage，of which many examples are adduced by Wets．
 Chrys．suggests，to avoid polluting the Temple with murder；and also，it should seem，to be more unrestrained than the Priests and Levite could decently permit，who appear to have them－ selves closed the doors，in order to preserve the Temple from pollution，and be thought to have
no hand in whatever might ensue．

34．Td d $\sigma \phi a \lambda d s]$＇what was assuredly $t$＇． truth．＇So xxii．30．\＆xxv．26．Tiv таред：－ $\lambda \eta$ iv．The word properly signifies a place $w t=$ tents map $\mu \beta \alpha^{\prime} \lambda \lambda$ оит al．But it here denotes： soldiers＇quarters in the castle of Antonia．A： this is confirmed by the avaßa日pois just aft－ for the castle of Antonia was situated on an $e=-$ nance．

35．routs dyak．］This term is supposed to： note the flight of stairs leading from the porn of the Temple to the castle of Antonia，wt： nearly joined the Temple，being built（as we i from Joseph．B．v．5，3．）at an angle of it． illustration of the present passage．I would duce an apposite one of Joseph．Bell．v．S． p．1220．7．seqq．Hubs．¿vટ̀otépụ \＆è toil：－ （scil．aV ）$\tau \dot{\delta} \pi \bar{\pi} \nu \delta \iota \alpha \alpha^{\sigma} \eta \mu \alpha$（I read，from（


 терібтоа тє каi ßa入aveīa nail oтрaтот：

 of $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \in t o v$ ．where by the tepiotore are int courts surrounded by columns．And by
 racks，laid out，it should seem，in quadrat； As to the words só入eas eivac doncìy，they 21 I suspect，corrupt．If correct，they can el refer to barracks；and then $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \in i o y ~ m u s t$ wrong．and $\beta a \sigma i l e i a$ would be required．i｜








 $\sigma o v, ~ є ̇ \pi i \tau \rho \epsilon 廿 o ́ v ~ \mu o t ~ \lambda a \lambda \eta ̄ \sigma a t ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ \lambda a o ́ v . ~$









such a description would not be suitable to the barracks，and is，no doubt，meant of the whole of the citadel，which formed a mort of military city． Now this sense（which is undoubtedly the true one ）may be obtained by simply reading mob ns instead of жо́久eis，and for donciv，doкei，or，from the Cod．Bigot．，doкoin，which evidently requires wó入ıs．
－Baनтá乌ধन0al］＇carried on their shoulders；＇ for security against the violence of the people． P＇ric．and Wets．，however，think the term does not mean that he was literally curried，but was borne off his legs by the press．And they pro－ duce a passage of Dis Chrys．where one is de－
 is here nothing said about a great press．

36．aipe aíróv］＇away with him，＇viz．from the earth．So xxii．22．alpe d $\pi \dot{d}$ ins $\gamma \eta s$ ．

37． $\boldsymbol{\text { l }}$ єєєбт \＆c．］Here there is，as at Math． xii．10．and often elsewhere，a blending of the patio direct with the indirecta，and thus the el is not put for annow．
 plied in Nehem．xiii．24．This is not a Latinism， since we find in Ken．Tyr．vii．5，11．tours $\Sigma v$－ pıनтl е́тıбтapévous．The interrogation here，as often，involves admiration．A view which re－ inoves the objection that has induced some to cancel the mark of interrogation．

38．Alyústios \＆c．］The story is related in Joseph．Ant．xx．8，6．\＆Bell．ii．13，5．，between which and the present passage a considerable discrepancy exists；on the methods of removing which（though，indeed，as the credit of the sacred writer cannot be impugned，it is scarcely worth notice）see Recens．Synop．Zicapiny．The term seems only to denote banditti，from sica，the short cutlass（ of Oriental origin，like the Kriesh of India and China）which was carried under
the arm．From being private assassins，the Sic．at length became public murderers and rebels．The air of the question seems to imply，that the officer had been told that Paul was that Egyptian．

XXII．3．dंvaтeӨрамие́vos－тєтаıঠ．］The Commentators are not agreed on the construction， some joining raja roil sodas $\Gamma$ ．with the pere－ ceding，others with the following．The former mode is generally adopted by the antient and early modern Commentators，the latter by the more recent Interpreters．The former，however，seems preferable．As to the regularity which the other Commentators would impart to the passage，that is not very characteristic of the Scriptural style， nor indeed much so of the style of the antients in general．And to the tautology of which they complain，we may oppose a harsh transposition in their own mode of construction．
The expression rapà rove tódas is an idiom implying no more than our being educated under such and such a master．Metatoevudvor－vouov， ＇trained［by him］to the most exact knowledge of the religion and laws of my country．＇Rosenm． observes that $\alpha \times p / \beta$ stay has reference to the cere－ monies and institutions of their ancestors．Wets．， Morns，Schleus．，and Kain．，however，ascribe to $d \times p i \beta$ ．the signification severity，as in Acts xxvi．5．and Sapient．xii．21．And so Isocr．
 It is difficult to decide the preference，and there may be an hypallage．By volos，Guin．ob－ serves，must be understood not merely the patrica lex，but also the тaтpixal tapadóбeเs mentioned in Gal．i．14．Tout Өeoû signifies＇of God＇s ［law］，i．e．what he then esteemed such．The Apostle speaks somewhat obscurely，intending by this use to delicately refute the charge of blaspheming the Law，by so speaking of it as to tacitly admit its divine origin．







 infr． 2812 ${ }_{8}$ Cor． 112.2 －Infr． 26.
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4．õs］The relative must be resolved，as often， into the demonstrative with a copula．
 nifies to look up，and sometimes only to look， namely，when it is followed by eis tiva，at any person or thing．In the Classical writers tive is used for eis tiva or Tl．See Matth．Gr．Gr． p．553．in which，among other passages，is cited
 тáoc．Sometimes the civa signifies re，and thus （ $\beta \lambda \epsilon \in \pi \in \iota \nu$ signifying to see）$\alpha y a \beta \lambda \epsilon \pi \epsilon เ \nu$ has the sense of recorer sight，or（as in Joh．ix．）to re－ ceive，obtain the facuity of cight．

14．Tdv díxalov］＇the Just one．＇See Note Lu．xxiii．44－47．

16．ayaбràs $\beta$ d́лтtoat \＆c．］See Note at 17．and ii． 38.

 $\sigma \in i$ ．See Note at $x .10$ ．Here，however， must be content to see through a glass dari since all human power of conception $n$ ． fail．
 фu入aкウ，a jail．The word is rare，but occur－ Sapient．xviii． 4.




 $\sigma \epsilon$ ．








20．nai aütde］＇1 too．＇Euvevdoncör．See Note on viii．1．And on фu入．$\tau \dot{\alpha} i_{\mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota \alpha,}$ see Note on vii．58．The penons employed in the office of stoning used to throw off their clothes， ixeòivarro，just as did the Athleta．No Macho ap．Athen．348．F．where it is said that in the Gymnasia there were persons appointed $\tau a i \mu a-$

21．wopeciou］The lord overrules the plea by simply repeating the ordor．

22．кatē̄кеע］So very many MSS．，early Edd．， and Fathers read for the common sa日市кoy．And it is received by almost every Falitor from Wets． to Vat．，and rightly；for the other two varr． lectt．both tend to strengthen this；and although the common reading might be defended by sup－ powing an ellip．of érrt，yet the weight of testi－ mony is so greatly in favour of waA $\bar{j}$ кey，that it cannot but be adopted． 1 suspect，indeed，that the common reading was a mere typographical error of the second Ed．of Frasmus，which thus crept into the Stephanic fild．See the very Learned Note of lorville cited in Recens．Synop．， where，among other things，be proves that the Imperf，is used in a Present sense．
 tors are by no means agreed on the sense of this phrase．See the details in Recens．Synop． It cannot mean＇rending their garments．＇nor ＇shaking their garments，as if in rage．Many （as P＇ric．，Wets．，Rosenm．，Schl．，Heinr．，Kuin．， and Wahl）take it to mean＇tassing up their garments；＇and think that this was done by thoee who were too diatant to othervise participate in the thing．And this toussing up of garments，like uearing of garments，was a mark of approbation． I see not，however，how pixtos will bear the sense toses＂p，nor how it could be thought to import any thing but disapprobation and anger． After all，the true interpretation seems to be that of Grot．，Tirinus，Parkh．，and Bretschn．，＇tossing off，and casting down their garments，＇as a pre－ paration for violence ；（just as our pugilists doff their clothes to box）a symbolical action quite in unison with the violent erpressions of such of their companions as stood near，and forming a lively picture of rabid fury．The interpretation seems to be placed beyond doubt hy a very simi－ lar passage adduced ly me in Rerens．Synop．
from Plato de Rep．p． 665 ．It may le observed， that there is here only a union of two senses，each elsewhere occurning in the N．＇T．and the Clas－ sical writers，viz．to cast down，and to cast off．

In кovioptò pa入入óvtion cis tò dípa we have expressed another symbolical actiom，quite in unison with the preceding ；for Grot．，Wets．， and Kuin．rightly take it of kicking up，or other－ wise throwing up dust into the air ；which，as appears from the Classical citations of Wets．， and the accounts of modern travellers，was then，and still is in the East，a frequent mode of raising a tumult．
24．＇Exeфф́youv aürụ．］The word signifies literally to raise the roice At a person；and has therefore two senses，either acclamo，applaud，as in Acts xii．22．；or inclamo，exclaim against，as here．
 There are few paseages which，from variety of reading and divensity of interpretation，are more perplexing than this．Sii or seren varr．lectt． exist ；but the only material diversity is between the singular and the plural．For the latter there is very considerable authority in MSS．and Ver－ sions；and it is adopted by Griesb．and Tittm． Yet the singular ought，by every principle of Criticism，to be retained，as being the more difficult reading；and the recent collations of Rinck confirm it．It makes，however，as will be seen，no very material difference in sense． As to the interpretation of the words，see the full details in Recens．Synop．Suffice it here to say，that one great error neems to run through most modern interpretations of this passage， which is to take i $\mu \bar{a} \sigma$ in the sense scourges，i．e． ＇they stretched him up for the scourges．＇This is very harsh；and I find no authority for that use of $/ \mu$ as in the plural．It is clear that the antient and some modern Interpreters rightly took it in the ordinary sense straps or thongs；as Mark i．7．Lu．iii．16．Joh．i．27．The plural is used because，it soems，the prisoner was fastened to the post，or block，with two straps． The employment of the Article，as Bp．Middl． suggests，shows that these thongs or belts were in common use．This is exceedingly confirmed by a passage of an antient Greek Martyrologist ad－ duced by me in Recens．Synop．，in a tract called Martyrium Tarachi：тepièóntes aùtoù tò










 Sexw＇s．








 4 ${ }^{4 \times 1} \times 2.12$



 теivate aütdy d̀ toîs má入ots，кal veúpots $\dot{\omega} \mu о$ is $\mu \alpha \sigma \boldsymbol{i}$ दтe．These straps or belts were， it should seem，fastened about the person some－ thing like the harness of our horses，at the same time confining his hands，and then attached to the post by something there provided to receive them．Mpoír．must（though not one of the Commentators has seen it）be referred to the Centurion，who，also，is said to do what he orders to be done，and sees done．Thus the construc－ tion is as if St．Luke had written，＇Rs dè троє́－
 cime tods aùtdv $\delta$ II，an hypallage common in the best writers．The sense is：＂And now Paul said to the Centurion，as he was having him bent forward［to the block］and［harnessed］ with the belts＇\＆c．The ellip．of $d \nu$ is supplied in a kindred passage of Job xxxix．10．ongers dè $a u ̈ \tau \delta \nu$ d̀v $\{\mu \bar{a} \sigma i\} u y o u ̂ ~ g o v . ~ T h e ~ a b o v e ~ v i e w ~$ is， 1 find，confirmed by Tittm．de Synon．N．T． p．162．，who pronounces the sense to be，＇vinctis manibus protendi jussit［ad cedendum］．＇The applying of these belts is what is alluded to at v .29 ．Where the Centurion is said to have been

－$\tau \dot{\delta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \boldsymbol{j} \tilde{\omega} \tau a]$ The Article has reference to the custom of the Romans to have a centurion to stand by and superintend the execution of any punishment．
28．‘ $\gamma \omega$ жо入入 imply surprise how a person of Paul＇s mean ap－ pearance could obtain this．Perceiving which， the Apostle makes a rejoinder removing this
difficulty，＂Aye，but I am even so by birth．＂ Kєфалaiou（at which supply xpin $\mu a$ ）signines properly the total arising from the addition ot several small sums；but as that generally im－ plies a tolerably round sum，so it came to meas a considerable sum．On the various modin whereby the freedom of Rome could be at－ tained by foreigners，i．e．by merit，or fame． by money，or by being freed from servitude，anil on the peculiar nature of the freedom claimetd by the citizens of Tarsus，see Recens．Synop．
 privilege of a Roman citizen under arrest，see the Notes of Kuin．and myself in Recen－ Synop．，where I have proved that the term $\dot{i} \in \mathrm{~F}^{\circ}$ ． here used refers only to his having had the belt－ applied in order to scourging，not to his beiuz put in irons，for Paul＇s citizenship was of a cla－－ which did not exempt him from that；and，iz point of fact，we find the bonds retained aft：： his liberation from the whipping－post，and bix is afterwards called $\delta \delta \delta \varepsilon^{\sigma} \mu$ cos．

XXIII．1．тето入（теицаі］＇I have conductei： myself．＇The word properly signifies to act i－ a citizen，and sometimes to conduct state affain Hence it came to mean conduct oneself，bekai： \＆c．，in which sense the word frequently occur－ in the later，writers．T Tō $\theta \in$ is put for $\boldsymbol{z}$ pu
 ing to the dictates of my conscience［whether as at first，ill informed，or not］．

3．тúxтciv－кєкоעוацéve］This is regard： by most Commentators as a prediction；whit， others，as Camer．，Zeger，Limb．Wets．，Heu mann，and most of the recent Commentater－ regard it as a formula malè precantis，q．d． $\mathbf{G}$ ．

















smite thee as thou hast smitten me! There is, indeed, some reason to think that Ananias came to a violent death about six years after. Yet we are hardly warranted in recognising a prediction; for the words have not the air of a prediction. Nor is there any prone of the fulfilment of that prediction; since, if Ananias did perish by volance, it would still be uncertain whether that was a judgment upon him for this, or for many bad actions in his life. We rather consider the expression as the ebullition of a spirit impatient of injury. I would not, however, consider the words as a formula male precantis, but as merely the too bitterly worded expression of a persuasion that God would punish Ananias for this outrage. This view is confirmed by Chrysost., Jerome, Augustin, and is adopted by Dr. Graves, cited in Recens. Synop.

Toil on кєкоע. Was a common metaphor to designate hypocrisy. See Note on Matt. xxiii. 37. How applicable this reproach was, we find from Josephus.

- кal $\sigma \dot{v} \kappa \alpha^{\prime} \theta_{\eta} \& c$.] The к al, when prefixed to interrogative sentences implying admiration, is best rendered itane? and so, so then. See


5. oúk pósiv-dpXuepeús] This ignorance of the Apostle has not a little perplexed Commentaters, whose various solutions may be seen detailed in Recess. Synop. and Towns. The only two which have any semblance of truth is 1 . that of Chrysost., Dionys., Cajet., Gataker, Wolf, Michaelis, and Townsend, who prove, from the History of the times, as found in Joseph., that Paul, who had only been a few days in Jerusalem, might not know that Ananias was then High Priest; or, as he had taken the office on himself, to which he was not entitled, the Aposthe might mean this as an indirect refusal to recognise his right. This, however, carries with it many circumstances of improbability ; and, after all, the most satisfactory solution of the difficulty will be found by taking ours ijoesv, with Bps. Sanderson and Mann, Episcopius, Beng.,

Wets., Peace, Valckn., Morus, Schott, and Kuin., supported by the antient Commentaries as found in the Catena, in the sense ' I did not reflect or consider;' thus excusing his impetuosty. And this interpretation is confirmed by what follows, where the rasp (as Bp. Pearce says) refers to a clause suppressed, qed. If I had considered, I should not have used these reproachful words, for \&cc. The above sense of the word is found both in the Scriptural (as Eph. vi. 8. Col. iii. 24.) and the Classical writers. Hence in Acts vii. 18. for $\mathfrak{y} \delta \in \iota$ some MSS. have, by gloss, $\epsilon \mu \nu \dot{j} \sigma \eta$.
6. $\pi \in \rho l$ er $\pi i \delta o s$ к al dעaनт. ven.] The best Commentators here suppose a Hendiadys. Yet we may render, 'for the hope of the dead and their resurrection.' K $\mathbf{~} \boldsymbol{i} \nu o \mu a t$ is a forensic term, but here seems to be used figuratively.
8. גјфóтєрa] Both antient and modern Interpreters stumble at this, since there seem to be three terms above mentioned, resurrection, angel, and spirit. To avoid this difficulty, some would cancel the $\mu \eta d \dot{d} d \gamma \gamma \in \lambda o v$. Others propose annthe (but most harsh) mode of punctuation.
 writers not very attentive to accuracy, be used of more than two. But of this we have no good proofs. St. Luke, I conceive, meant to advert to the two points of difference between the Sharises and Sadducees; and the two things refired to are (as I find Wakef., Newt., and Middy. have pointed out ) the Resurrection, and the Existence of Immaterial Beings; xעeūma and dyyelos being considered as falling under the same head. 'O$\mu 0 \lambda o \gamma o u ̈ \sigma t ~ s i g n i f i e s ~ ' p r o f e s s ~[b e-~$ lief in] ;' as in Joh. xii. 42. Rom. x. 10.
9. $\delta \iota \in \mu \dot{\alpha}$ хоуто] The sense is, ' they contended on behalf of Paul.' The word is also used by the Classical writers; not, however, followed by Aéyoures, but by an Infin. with an Accus., as in Thucyd. iii. 40 \&c 42 ., where see my Notes. Mépous, 'party;' a sense confined to the later writers.
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of removing the difficulty which has here been felt，is to suppose an aposiopesis，such as is often found in the best writers，when something which we do not care to directly mention is omitted． Chrys．supplies moĩo ${ }^{\circ} \gamma \kappa \lambda \eta \mu a$ ，and the antient Syr．something similar．As to the words follow－
 4 inferior Versions，and some Fathers，and can－ celled by Griesb．and Knapp；but without rea－ son．The external authority for so doing is very slender；and the internal is quite against the omission．Kuin．has ably traced the origin of the omission to an ill founded objection to the words，as if too much favouring Christianity．To suppose them introduced from v .39 ．，is too hy－ pothetical．All that can be said is，that the two passages are very similar．Besides，the aposio－ pesis before would be intolerably harsh without these words．

The angel，or spirit，is thought to have refe－ rence to the two kinds of appearance，which those who were inclined to think with Paul ascribed to the Divine appearance narrated by the Apostle；for those appearances were always supposed to take place through the medium of an angel，or at least a spirit．

10．$\mu \eta$＇\＆$\alpha \sigma \sigma a \sigma \theta \hat{y}]$ Pric．，Kyp．，and Wets． have proved by examples，that the term is often
used of great violence，but short of death．Ti． orpa＇тєupa，＇the forces．＇The word is a mu medice significationis，and signifies sometimes a whole armament，sometimes，as here，a suad！ force．

11．ยสเनтàs］See Lu．ii．9．Acts．xii． 7.
12．$\sigma v \sigma \tau \rho \circ \phi \eta \nu$＇a conspiracy．＇A significa－ tion which should seem to be very rare，since the Commentators adduce no examples of it．I have，however，produced some from Dionys． Hal．，Josephus，and Artemid．，in Recens．Syaop． These persons were probably Zelota，or Sicari： set on by Ananias and his party；at least they were． as the Scotch say，＂heart and part＂with ther．
－ave日eนátivav غ．］This dva日．implied the binding oneself under a curse to do any thing． and（as Selden and Wets．have shown）wa： sometimes，as in the present case，accompanied with a resolution not to eat or drink until the accomplishment of the thing vowed．

15．ецфаviбare］＇give notice by letter．＇A forensic term．$\Delta t a \gamma \iota \nu \omega \sigma^{\prime} \times c o$ has here the sense． also forensic，of examine，literally determine some point，of which examples are given by Wet： and Loesner．Mod тov dyץíat aítov．Name－ ly，that the Sanhedrim might not be thought to have any hand in the thing．＇Eapev．The nar－ rutive Present put for the Future．




















 popular form of expression，whose meaning is not to be pressed on，signifying little more than taking aside，and expecially used of drawing any one to a private place；as，indeed，appears from the examples adduced by－Pricæus，from Ach． Tat．and Herodian．

21．Tìv $\alpha \pi \delta$ avì drayre入iav］．The Com－ mentators are not agreed whether this should be explained promise or order．There is much to be urged for either sense，but the context rather requires the latter．Render，＇the order to be given by you for Paul to be brought up．＇
22．下aparүєi入as－трós $\mu \epsilon$ ］See Note supra v． 24 ．
23．סeEıo入áßous］With this word，as being a term of rare occurrence，the Commentators have been not a litule perplexed．Some would read $\delta_{\in}$ Etoßó入ows，from one MS．and a few Versions． But that plainly arose from the conjecture of those who could not explain $\delta \in \xi$ to $\lambda \alpha \beta$ ous，which is generally supposed to denote lictors，like our proviost marshal and his attendants．But al－ though there is reason to think that the word came，in after ages，to mean that，yet it were abwurd to suppose，so many lictors to be attend－ ant on the tribune＇s forces that 200 should be sent to guard one prisoner．One of the most probable opinions is that of Beza，Drus．，Kuin．， Schleus．，and Wahl，that they were body－guards of the tribune，so called from taking the right aide of any one，（as being the unguarded side． See Thucyd．iii． 23. v． $10 \& 71$ ．）and guarding him．Thus they would be something like the pratorians．I should rather think，however， that they were a kind of troops attendant on the heavy－armed and the cavalry，like the $\ddot{\boldsymbol{q}} \mu \boldsymbol{\phi} \boldsymbol{\pi} \pi$
mentioned in Thucyd，v．57．and elsewhere，of whom see my Note there．They were，it should seem，light armed，and similar to the lancearii， who，as we find from Ammian．xxi．13．，cited by Wets．，covered in battle the right side．They performed the duties both of exploratores，of attendant soldiers on the heavy－armed，and pro－ bably sometimes of body－guards on the principal officers．

24．אTทivy］There is no occasion to suppose， with Kuin．，that the beasts were for Paul and the two soldiers who beld his chains．We may very well imagine the beasts to have been meant for Paul only．In so long and rapid a journey he would require more than one horse．The cavalry，we know，used（as the Tartars and other Oriental nations now do）often to take with them each a led horse；by which means they travelled very long distances without stopping．

25．Teptéx．Tdv túxov Toütov］There is no necessity，with Valckn．，Heinr．，and Kuin．，so to press on the primitive sense of the word，as to suppose that St．Luke has given us not the letter，but only what were probably the con－ tents of it．What St．Luke has given us was probably from a copy of the letter preserved by himself or by Paul，from the persons who kept the public records．Paul，during his tedious captrvity at Csesarea，would be desirous of knowing the contents of the Epistle，which was of the sort called elogia，（see Recens．Synop．） and probably preserved a copy，which Luke had the opportunity of using．

26．кратібтю］The usual and formal epithet omployed in addressing a magistrate，as we say
 Note on Acts xv． 23.



入ov́uєvov $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ Yŋт











 є́ $\emptyset$ ，öтау каi oi катй




 attempt to clear Lysias（as some Commentators do）of petty misrepresentation．He ventured to take a little more credit for zeal in behalf of his fellow citizens than he deserved．

31．グүayou stà Tis－＇A．］From the itineraries brought to light by the research of Reland，we are enabled pretty correctly to trace both the route and the stages of it；namely，to Neopolis 22 miles；to Lydda（or Diospolis） 10 ；to Anti－ patris 10 ；to Cassarea 6．But 42 miles would seem a distance too great for one night，even supposing all the rapidity of a forced march． And yet the words yizayov els Tiv＇A．seem to claim this sense；at least no other could be thought of in a Classical writer．Most Com－ mentators，as Reland，Biscoe，Doddr．，Schleus．， and Kuin．，think it is not necessary to suppose that he was conveyed thither in one night；and they render by night，i．e．by the next night． But it could only mean in the course of the next night，which would be too long a time to allow． It therefore appears safer to understand $\delta \iota \dot{\alpha} \tau_{\bar{\eta}}$ s vuкtos of the night on which they set out， namely，at nine $0^{\prime}$ clock．And perhaps no more is meant by this expression（which seems a popular one）than that they conveyed Paul all night long towards Antipatris，and arrived there without halting．Naw，as they might，by rapid marching（the cavalry helping the infantry） arrive thither by ten or eleven o＇clock in the
morning ；and as by far the greater part of tbe journey would be really thus accomplished，ther might be said to have conveyed him thither das тї

33．divadóvtes］A term appropriate to deli－ vering letters，the ajva meaning re．

35．dьакои́боцаí］This implies a diligent and thorough hearing．T $\bar{\varphi}$ трatronptep T．＇R．This is supposed to denote a palace formerly built by Herod，but then used as the residence of the provincial governor．

XXIV．1．цeтá ठ̀ тévтe ग̀ $\mu$ ：］This is by some of the best Commentators explained，from Paul＇s arrival at Cesaren；by others，from the time of the nutice given to the High Priest by Cyprias，which was on the day before Paul＇s arrival at Cesarea．
 22．and Note．Almost all the best Commenta－ tors are agreed in regarding this as a foremsic term，equivalent to the Latin one comparere in judicio，or coram judice．It may，however． have the signification assigned by the Syr．Vers．， Ammonius，Pric．，Grot．，and Wets．，gave in： formation．＇Príooos．The word probably de－ notes an orator．But as orators，who harangued on the public business before the public assern－ bly，sometimes had the causes of private per－ sons confided to them，so it came to signify an advocate，and at length merely a ploader．or barrister，as here．















3. cipiuns] The word here signifies public and political tranquillity, namely, from the troubless under which they had laboured, of rebels, brigands, robbers, and other disturbers of the peace. That Felix deserved this praise, is attested by Joseph. Ant. xx. 8, 4. cited by Wets.
 I have proved in Recens. Synop.) a term used in bending, and signifies 1. to take a straight course doorn to the end; 2. to conduct an affair to a prosperous issue, and, in the passive, to be conducted \&c.; as Thucyd. ii. 65. where катор-
 unsuccessful. Thus кaтop $\theta \omega \mu \alpha$ denoted the thing thus brought to a successful issue, of which many examples are adduced by Wets. Sometimes it denotes generally success or prosperity,
 that the old Romans used to ascribe national prosperity to the Gods; while, in after times, whatever happened prosperously was ascribed to the prudent counsels, and even the six $n$ of their governors, or generals, without any mention of Divine Providence. See Doildr. Пàvтク te val maveaxoū. It is not agreed among Editors and Critics, whether these words should be taken with the preceding, or the following. The most eminent, however, take the firmer view. And this gives the most natural construction, and yields the best sense. The sense is 'in every respect,' ( or 'at all times') and 'in every place.'
 accept at any one's hands. and, by implication, to approve, commend, and is used both of persons and things.
 may not, longer than is necessary, hinder or detain you [from other business]'. 'Eरко́дтect signifies properly to cut a ditch, as a separation between two plots of ground, and hence to separate, detain, sic. इuytómos. The construction is left imperfect, so that we must either supply Ae Góvrous, with inst Commentators; or, adopt a transposition. and construe ovviómoss before тларакаА 10 . There is a blending of two senfences into one, and when written at length, It would thus stand: "I $\nu$ a $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \dot{e} \mu \dot{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \pi i \quad \pi \lambda \epsilon \bar{o} \nu \nu \dot{\epsilon}$
 \&c.
5. eipóvrer $\gamma \dot{a} \rho \& c$.] The $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ has the inchoutive force, and may be rendered nempe. In cipóvres the Commentators suppose an ellip. of
 eïpoнev; of which they adduce examples. But in the passages they cite no other principle can be resorted to: here it is better to regard the phraseology as falling under the figure anacoluthin, especially as the sentence is very long and involved, of which numerous examples might be adduced from Thucyd. See Note on xvi. 22.
 say. Rather $\lambda$ осцско́тaтov, which is justified by the usage of the best writers, from whom examples are adduced by Wets. and Kypke, almost entirely, however, from the later writers, as SAlian V. H. xiv. 11. dob Ens ф póvrı̧̧e, $\alpha \lambda \lambda \alpha$
 jyıfia. where for sal mil I conjecture s ai $\eta$. By ${ }_{\eta}{ }^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \gamma$. yod os is there meant a pestilence like that at Athens, which, as we find from Thucydides and others, was called $\dot{\eta} \mu \in \gamma^{\prime} \lambda_{\eta}$ vol os. Strictly speaking, the noun here is not put for the cognate adjective, but is used according to a frequent Greek idiom, by which a noun in its most abstract sense is as it were personified by taking the attribute inherent in the noun, and
 see Note on Lu. ii. 1.

- $\pi \rho \omega \tau о \sigma \tau \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$ ] The word properly denoted the first man on the right. in a live of troops, since, in moving, he guides the course of the
 $\delta \epsilon \xi$ fou кéposs. where see my Note. But it is by later writers used to denote a front rank man, and sometimes, figuratively, a principal person. On NaY cop. see Note at ii. 22 .

8. map' ovid] Namely, to Paul; though some antient and modern Commentators refer it to Lysias. The divaкpivas is supposed to refer to the examination by torture. After all, however, I am inclined to think, with Rinck, that the true reading ix $\pi a \rho^{\prime}{ }^{\circ} \dot{\nu}$, , which is found in six MSS., and is countenanced by some others.
9. ouviƠ(cto] Many Mss., some Versions,











and Fathers, and the early Edd., with the exception of the Erasmian, for ouvé日evto have $\sigma \nu u \in \pi i \theta \in \nu \tau 0$, which has been adopted by almost every Editor from Wets. down to Vat.; and perhaps rightly. But the common reading, may well be defended in the sense assented; and if mu just before be the true reading, this must likewise. इuveтétevto will signify 'acted in concert, which is confirmed by Thucyd. iii. 54.
 signification the word occurs in Deut. xxxii. 27. 1's. iii. 6. and elsewhere.
10. vévavtos] 'nutu significavit.' Or the sense may be, 'gave him permission by a nod or beckoning;' the nature of which expression. and the similar one עєúmart xp $\dot{\sigma} a \sigma \theta a \iota \& c$., I have fully illustrated in my Note on Thucyd. i. 134. No. 4. Transl.

- крเтiv] This term is used because the Procurator united the judicial functions to the
 Sub. тра́ $\gamma \mu a \tau \alpha$. Munthe aptly compares Diod.


11. ঠvvapévou oou juc̄vat] The sense is, 'erpecially since thou canst ascertain.' 'Hpépat cencióvo. It is by no means easy to reconcile this number with facts. The chronology of this period may be laid down as follows. On the tirst day, St. l’aul arrives at Jerusalem. 2d. Attends the meeting of the Presbyters. 3d. Commences his week of votive abstinence, which he continues on the 4 th, 5 th, 6 th, 7 th, and 8 th, (for that seems required by the words at $\times x i$. 27. wis
 On the same day he is assaulted by the Jews, and committed to the castle. On the 9 th day he is brought before the Sanhedrim. The $10 t h$ he spends in the castle (during which the plot asainst him is formed). On the night of the l0th he is removed to Antipatris, where he arrives early on the 11th day; and on the 12th he reaches Cesarea. The remaining day is not recknned, probably (as Kuin. suggests) because it is not in question, as he could then excite no tumult.

The Dative $\mu$ ot must here be accounted for on the principle thus detailed by Matth. Gr. Gr. $\$ 300$.
The $\hat{n}$ before deckaióo is not found in very many MSS. and some Fathers, and the early Edd., and is cancelled by Wets.. Matth., Griesb., Tittm., and Vat.; and rightly; for it is far
easier to account for its insertion than for its omission.
 but it is found in the Sept., Joseph., Sext. Erop. and others cited by the Commentators. Eus:$\sigma r a \sigma \theta a t$ is found in the best Classical writers. See my Note on Thucyd. v. 34.
13. тарабтî́aí 'establish, prove.' The word properly, signifies 'to bring a thing mapa to [proof of].'
14. $\delta \mu o \lambda o \gamma^{\infty}$ Sxc.] After having refuted the charge of sedition, the Apostle proceeds to encounter that of taking up and maintaining a religion different from that of his countrymen. This he does by showing, that the doctrimes be professes are not toere novelties, (or sectarima) but that he worships the same God with the Jews, receives the same sacred books, and has the same belief in the resurrection, both of the just and of the unjust ; conformably to which he labours to preserve a conscience void of offeact towards God and towards man.

Alpeots properly denotes only the taking up of an opinion, whether well or ill founded; and sometimes it was applied to the persons who maintained the opinions. Hence many enainen: Commentators here render it sect; a sense whick the word does bear in other passages of St. Lakf. But the context will here scarcely permit it, ani it should seem that St. Paul means to take exception at the invidious sense which the word admitted, and in which it was used by his oppornents; just as in our word new-fangled. whict properly denotes only what is newly takere. Tha. St. Luke and Josephus use the word in a sth sense is no proof that that was the general accep tation. St. Paul (with whose phraseology s. have here to do) always uses it in a bad sense. i an opinion taken up on slight grounds. And does St. Peter. And this sense is here require. by the words óod $\nu$ and wis $\lambda$ érovar.
 as in v. 30. Gen. xxxii. $9 \& 10$, and elsewhert Of the phrase xatpóot Oeol the Commentalor adduce many examples from the Classical writerBut the sense in almost all the passages citerd , not the Gods of any one's ancestors, but the Cro: worshipped at any place. A more applical: example may be found in Thucyd. ii. 71. Wher see my Note. As the privilege of worshippiril their $\Theta e d s$ tátpeyos had been secured to in Jews hy many Imperial charters, so Painl heret,
















throws himself under the protection of those laws.
 ain te sal aooicun. for that seems to have been the general opinion of the Pharisees, though some of them (as we learn from Josephus) believed only in a resurrection of the just. The opinion, however, as Drus. and Kin. show, was new and not extensively held.
 of that [hope],' ' on that account.' 'A $\sigma \times \bar{\omega}$. This is to be taken intransitively; of which use the Commentators adduce several examples; and others may be seen in Dr. Blomfield's Note on
 'Axpook. is one of those adjectives which admit either an active or a passive sense. The former is here adopted. What is properly applicable only to the person acting, or to the action, is applied to the conscience, as the regulator of the conduct.
17. Here the Apostle answers to the third point of accusation, profanation of the Temple. , $\Delta s^{\prime}$ stay $\pi$ 入ecóvos. 'after very many years;' of which sense of ida the Commentators adduce no examples. I have, however, cited several in Recens. Syn. from Thucyd. and Aristoph. Motciv ìequoouvas is an Hellenistic phrase signifrying to give alms. Here, however, it must, from circumstances, be interpreted to present. Paul hints that as his purpose was both bentvolent and pious, he was unlikely to have been guilty of profanation of the Temple.
18. H $\mathbf{H} \nu / \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu o v]$ ' living in votive sanctimony.' Tines $\delta \dot{\text { en }}$. So the Erasmian and Stephatic Fd. read. But the od (which is not found in the FA. Prince. and some other early Hid.) was cancelled by Beza, though recalled by Griesb., but, as I have proved at large in Recens. Synop., very uncritically.

20, aúrol oürot ] 'these very persons.' Et before $\tau t$ is not found in very many MSS., Vier-
sons, and early Fd., and is cancelled by most Editors from Wets. to Vat.; rightly, it should seem; for we can far better account for its inserlion than for its omission. Adíxnpa may be rendered misdemeanour or offence. So xviii. 14.

21. if 'otherwise than.' In tupi pıäs raúrys $\phi \infty \nu \bar{y}$ there is, as Beta remarks, a delicate irony, q. d. except for this one speech, if they can make an offence of that. See 2 Cor. xii. 13.
 off the decision of their causes. 'Ayah. signifies to defer a thing (ava) to another time, as avatitévat to épyov. It has almost always an Accusative of the thing, and is sometimes used absolutely. But when the business deferred is not our own, but another's, he may be said figuratively to put him off. And so here, and sometimes in the later Classical writers.
 interpretation of these words is that of our common Version and Wets. ' having become better acquainted with Christianity, namely, from the account just given by St. Paul, as well as from what he had learnt during his residence at Caesarea.
23. Tipeiodat and execs, in this verse, are of such opposite sense, that it would seem they cannot be conjoined. Hence most recent Consmentators place no stop after ävecuv, but connett exert avery with the words following, which they suppose exegetical of these. See Kuin. This, however, is scarcely satisfactory; and the exert seems to have a signification more special. There can be little doubt but that the words are to be taken with the preceding, as they were by the antients and the earlier modern
 be meant to qualify the rupgiotac, and the sense must be, 'He ordained him to be kept in hold, and [at the same time] to enjoy some relaxation [of his confinement], namely, some











Commentators think，by being kept $\overline{\text { }} \boldsymbol{\nu} \phi u \lambda a \kappa \hat{\eta}$ didé $\mu$ e．But that is irreconcilable with xxvi．25， and perhaps inconsistent with the due security of his person，as his friends were allowed to visit him．It should rather seem that what is meant by the $\alpha v e \sigma t s$ is the changing the close custody of a prison into the milder durance of the cos－ todia militarist，on which see Note supra xxii． 29. Of the phrase exec advert in this sense an ex－ ample is cited by Loesner from Philo；and бoūvaı ávéar occurs in 2 Chron．xxiii． 15 ．and 3 Eadr．iv．62．The words kail $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \dot{\operatorname{cog}}$－aürū are not meant to explain the preceding order， but to add another privilege，which did not be－ long to the custodia militaris，but solely apper－ trained to the custodial libera，or the фu入axi alder $\quad$ uss．I have removed the comma after Maul－ dol，because the words must be closely con－ netted with the preceding，as limiting their sense．The antient Syriac Translator saw this by rendering，＇$u t$ servaretur in quieted．＇
1 must not omit to state，that instead of $\tau \delta \nu$ Haiǹod ten MSS．and some inferior Versions lave aividy，which was preferred by Mill and Beng．，and has been edited by Griesb．，＇Tittm．， and C at．；but rashly．For though it may seem countenanced by a Critical reason，yet it is，in fact，not ；since if aivì were the original read－ ing，we can scarcely conceive why such a mar－ gimmal gloss as tod II aüdov should have been so prevalent，as to eject the true reading in all the Ils．but ten．That very wide difference in Ms．authority between the two readings makes me rather suspect that aïrò came from the margin，where it was probably placed to express that it should le supplied per ellipsin at exetv． The remark，it may be supposed，was made by those who did not perceive the true connexion above spoken of，and that the construction was：

 confirm the old reading．
23．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu l \dot{c} i \omega \nu]$ i．c．‘ all persons in any way connected with him．［his own］whether as rela－ tons or friends．Of which sense l．oesn．adduces some examples from Philo，and Wets．one from Polyp．＇ran
24．auvoū］This is omitted in several MSS． and Theophyl．，and is cancelled by Griesb．and others ；perhaps rightly；for in several MSS． ionia is read ；and in some both $l \delta i \dot{a}$ and aúroù． Thus there is some reason to suspect both of them to be from the margin．The words ovary＇lou－ dario sem meant to assign the reason why Felix
brought Drusilla with him．She，being a Jews； would take some interest in the question a： the truth of the Christian religion．By from aùvoü refl is，I conceive，meant＇beard $x$ ； he had to say concerning，which implies； mission to speak on the subject．
25．ठıкalo oívys kali dyкр．］These were e： coaly mentioned，both as being the print， the moral duties（which the Apostle，doubt treated on，with reference to their being ：－ sary to prepare for the judgment to come because his auditors were especially defic： those duties．For by $d \gamma \times \rho a \tau e i a$ he mira： only temperance，but chastity，of which use adduces one example from Xenoph．，and in Recens．Synop．added two others from ． and Sext．Emp．
－roù крíaquos tout $\mu$ ．］Our English lators have not expressed the Article． Waken．renders＇$a$ judgment to come．＇ is certainly wrong ；and so probably our lators；for the row seems to have referen． doctrine，as well known to Drusilla and known to Felix．，＂Eんфовоs Yєpómevers in fear or alarm．＇On the origin，nat extent of this feeling the Commentators speculate．See Recens．Synop．
－ $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\nu} \nu \ddot{\nu} \nu$ ex Yo］An Attic and dele： meaning＇for the present，＇of which mentators adduce many examples． in Recons．Synop．compared a similar ， from nearly the same cause，receiver from Dionysius，the tyrant of Sicily． Dionys．C．5．Kaıро̀ цета入аßсо́v． gadded as a Hellenistic phrase for cain， or каıюой нeта入．Yet Kypke has a example from Polyp．ii．16．Merak ккирд̀ а́рно́ттоута．
 the Commentators as a participle ic $\eta \lambda \pi \imath \sigma \epsilon$ ．But it may，in constructi． pended on the $d \pi \epsilon \kappa \rho i \theta \eta$ preceding． dependant on it two expressions d． two causes which induced Felix to gi dismission；1．because he felt ane apprehension，and 2 ．because it wis to dismiss him and send for him again The de here is omitted in very man some Versions，and early Fddi．，and by Wets．，Math．，Gricsb．，Knapp， It may have been a mere emendation following：but 1 cannot approve cancelled，because of such passage： lowing．Thucyil．i．25，3．inter



 тòv llaû̀ov סєסєmévov.











 \&c.
27. סcerias $\pi \lambda_{n \rho \omega 0} 0$.] Namely, the two years of Paul's captivity; that being the subject of the present narration. It is truly observed by Lightf., that the sacred writers often number ty tacit or unnamed epochs, as in 2 Sam.xv.7. 2 Chron. xxii. 2. Ez. 1. 1.

- Xápıtar кara0்̇odat rois 'I.] An elegant phrase, by which favours are considered as a deposit, to be taken up afterwards. The Commentators adduce many examples, and others may be seen in my Note on Thucyd. i. 33.

It was usual for Roman governors to confer some favour on vacating their post, and one of these, as we learn from Josephus, was by a general gaol delivery, probably given here, but of the benefit of which Paul was denied, that a greater favour might be done to the Jews.
XXV. 1. $d_{\pi} \beta_{a} \beta_{s} \tau_{j}{ }^{2} \pi a \rho X[a]$ This should be rendered, 'after entering upon his government. B $\pi 4$, is a vox sol. de hac $r e$.
2. dveфdviनay] See Note supra xxiv. 1.
3. aitoímeyol $\chi$ dipu кат' aن்тoî]. There seems a harshness in this expression, which is indeed remover in some MS8. and Versions, which read sap' auंroū. But that is evidently a mere emendation. It is better to take cara (as I proposed in Recens. Synop.) in the sense concerning. But even that is unnecessary, and we may consider the expression as a breviloquentia for altoú-
 is confirmed by the words at V . 15. altoúmevos
 not, with many of the best Commentators take rocourres in a Future sense; for the difficulty stated by them may be removed by taking dved. r. Fguratively for 'having laid a plot,' as in xxiii. 16. बкovaas riv dvédpay. and frequently both in the O. T. and the Classical writers.
4. dxexpi0ŋ tnpeio 0 at] I have in Recens. Synop. proved, that the sense cannot be (as almost all Translators and Commentators sup; pose) ' he answered, ordering that Paul should
be kept ;' but, by reason of the clause following, it can admit of no other sense than, "He answered, that Paul was in confinement at Cesarea, meaning, that where his place of confinement was, and where the residence of the Procurator was, there his trial ought to be. See more in Recens. Syoop. This mode of taking the words is confirmed by the Peshito Syr., and the Vulg., the former of which well renders, "Reddidit responsum ; Paulus servatur Csesareze, et ego festino proficiscar.' At inжopevieotat there is an ellip. of exci, as often in verts of motion.
5. of סuvarol] The sense is, 'the persons of weight and consequence among you,' the of
 and most of the best modern Commentators, who adduce many examples from Philo and Josephus. And so Thucyd. iii. 27. Toies סvvatoús. ii. 65. ol duy. iii. 47. тoĩs ס. viii. 63. тwi้ इapion Tois d., the magistrates.
6. ทiц́pą-déка] There are few pascages which are more perplexed by variety of reading than this. See Griesb. The common reading cannot well be defended; for its external authority is not great, and its internal very slender. Beza, Beng., and Grot. have seen that the context requires that the ov, which is found in many of the best MSS., inserted before $\pi$ ieious, should be adopted. And so Beza edited; though the word was afterwards thrown out by Schmid, or the Elzevir Editor. Are we, then, to read, with Griesb., Knapp, and
 think not; for there is no proof that the antients used such an idiom of what was past and certain. Besides, it will be difficult to account for the omission of dxres. I suspect that the reading of Griesb. is componncled of two readings, each of which is found in the MSS., and of which the true one is doubtless darce, for which there is great authority in MSS., Versions, and early Editions. The mistake, I apprehend, arose from itacism, which would originate à var. lect. upon í (8), magnlyé (10). If,
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however, the first mentioned objection to Criesbach's reading can be removed, I would receive
 absorb the other. At present, I have edited as Wets. directs should be read.
7. altı $\alpha \mu a \tau a]$ Several MSS. and early Fd. have alrıópara, which is adopted by Wets. and edited by Griesb., Knapp, and Valpy; but wrongly; for there is no proof that such a word as alt ı $\bar{\omega} \mu \alpha$ ever existed; and it is so contrary to analogy, that it scarcely could; especially as it was not needed, altiapa being in use, as I have in Recens. Synop. proved by examples from Thucyd., Eurip., Dio Cases., and Plutarch. To prefer a word which occurs no where, and is contrary to analogy, to one which is found five or six times in the best writers, argues an ignorance of Criticism, such as is disgraceful to an Editor of Griesbach's reputation, who ought to have seen that alrtcópa is a mere error of the scribes, who often confounded a and $\infty$.
9. 0 e $\lambda_{\text {els }}$ \&cc.] It does not appear that Festus knew any thing of the intended assassination of Paul, on the road between Cæsarea and Jerusalem. He might speak this, partly to gratify the Jews, who, he saw, were so earnestly desirous to get Paul to Jerusalem; and partly, because he was at a loss, as he pretended (v.20.), how to proceed in the case, and willing to shift the matter from himself; otherwise he could not but know, that a person who was innocent at Casarea, could not be found guilty at Jerksalem; and he plainly saw that Paul was innocent. Why then did he not acquit him? The true answer is, he durst not disoblige the Jews. But Paul was so well acquainted with their temper, that he chose to trust himself to Heathens rather than to those of his own religion; and he had reason to suspect that Festus would give him up, rather than incur the displeasure of the Jews; so that his safest way was to appeal to
the Emperor, as a Roman Citizen. (Marklans Paul, as being a Roman citizen, whose cahad been brought into the President's coo: could not be compelled to have his cause shy! to Jerusalem to be tried by the Sanhedri subject to the confirmation of the President
10. той Bŕmatos K.] 'Cesar's court :" it might be so called, as being held by President on the authority of Caesar, anil his name. At $\mu \in \delta \in \bar{i}$ крiveodac there iclip. of Móvov, though the $\delta \in \bar{i}$ seems to at the delay of judgment for two years. H Ahoy, 'very well,' as 2 Tim. i. 18. Be入rion $\boldsymbol{\nu} \mathbf{N}^{\prime} \sigma \kappa$ cts. See Math. Gr. Gr. 9457. and Gr. Gr. p. 87.
11. el $\mu \grave{y} \nu$ yaj-drooaveĩy] The sen is expressed populariter, and the yap has once to a clause omitted. The sense $\mathrm{m}_{2}$ thus represented: For tried I desire to that it be but at a proper tribunal, ant be found guilty of any offence, which Roman laws is punished with death, I not decline even death.' Oi mapaetoè. dxodaveĩ is an elegant and not unusu mula, of which the Commentators adduct examples.

- Oúdols-Xapíaröat] A delicate n censuring Festus for wishing to do a favour Jews at Paul's expense, and meant to him that he has not the pouter. Siret. that dúvarat refers to latoful right, as to say, "no one can, salvo jure j" and Xapiбao日at is meant give up for tries, would be equivalent to condemnation: the use of the word xapio. shows th understood that Festus meant xofpera 'Iovoaions, and it alludes (as Marks. C to his making a present of him, or giving out of favour, without regard to right. :
 sores of the President, something like Boudoc of the Lacedæmonian kings and























mentioned in Thucyd. See Casaub. Exec. Antibar. p. 137.
 make the sentence declarative. But that, 1 think, weakens the spirit of the words, and the interrogation is confirmed by the Syriac and Vulg.
 pay their respects to.' see 2 Kings x. 13.
 cumstances of Paul's case, thus referring it to his better judgment. With the $\tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \tau \delta \nu \Pi$. I would compare Thucyd. iii. 68. тג ката П $\Pi \lambda$ trial.

15. ठiкnv] for катадíкทy, judgment, i. e. condemnation and punishment; as in Thess.i.9. A signification occurring in the Classical writers, from whom Kin. adduces several examples.
16. xapగfcooai-dmaidecay] A brief manner of expression, of which the sense is ' to give up any one to condemnation and destruction (i.e. capital punishment) ont of favour to another. In this sense xapícoolat occurs at r. 11 ; (and so Seneca says damnare aliquem gratian scil. alicujus) and dradteca is so used in Hist. of Bel
 See also Acts viii. 20. The sense of тס́roy $d$ doloylas $\lambda d \beta o c$ is, ' and shall have opportunity for exculpating himself.' This sense of тóros indeed often occurs with diobovat, but very rarely with $\lambda a \mu \beta$ ávelv.

delay.' An elegant phrase. So Thucyd. ii. 42. 4.

17. $\pi$ efl oi] This must be construed with

 Festus might think it was a charge of sedition and robbery. 'Ext巾épeiv altiay is a frequent phrase in the best Greek writers, corresponding to the crimes inferre of the Roman ones.
18. ऍทrijaтa] 'subjects for discussion and controversy. Deiatdalmovias. Not superstition, but, as the best Commentators have been long agreed, religion. And so the Syriac Version. The word is often used in this sense in Josephus, especially in several Edicts of the Emperors giving the Jews complete toleration to profess their religion.
 not, with some Commentators, be referred to the affair of Jesus' being alive; but, by an ellip. of mpdyuaros, to the whole matter in question, the point in controversy.
 Or izixax. may be rendered 'making his appeal;' which includes the sense 'claiming. $\Delta$ cáyvcostv, 'determination.' It has reference to the sense cause included in aùróv. 乏eßaotoī Augustus. The sumame borne by all the Emperours from Cesar Octavianus, who first assummed it.




















renders＇I desire to hear ；＇the Vulg．and Erasm． still worse，＇volebam．＇The Syr．and almost all other Versions and Translations rightly render vellem，＇I could wish．＇Yet there is not，as Comer．imagines，an clip．of $\hat{\alpha} \nu$ ；for，as $I$ have fully proved on Thucyd．iv．54．3．（Ed．and Transl．）Imperfects Indicative are often put for Pluperfects Subjunctive，and 1 have adduced numerous examples．The sense therefore is， ＂I could have wished to have heard him ；＇a modest way of saying＇I could wish to hear him．＂
23．фcauraolas］＇pomp，＇state；literally， display．Of the word and the sense several ex－ samples are adduced by the Commentators，as
 фаутабias．Heliodor．фаитаनlas тळ̄ $\delta$ ори－
 which exactly represents the sort of pomp here meant．The word is，indeed，susceptible both of a good and bad sense；but there is no reason to here suppose the latter with some Commen－ taters．＇Axpoatriforo is explained judgment－ hall，as auditorium is often used in the Latin．If such be the sense，it is a Latinism．As，how－ ever there was no trial，it should rather seem to mean＇a private examination room，＇where ac－ cued persons had a hearing before they were

 eíreßis．
24．of $\sigma u \mu \pi а \rho o ́ v т e s] ~ i . ~ e . ~ o l ~ \sigma u ́ \mu \beta o u \lambda o t, ~ \xi u \mu-~$ udpedpo，mentioned above at v．12．This cus－ tom is illustrated by Wets．from Joseph．Ant．
 таракаөе〒о́меvov．\＆xvii．5， 3.
－ìvétuxó，$\mu$ tot］＇have made urgent appli－ cation to me．＇The word properly signifies＇to address oneself to，hold converse with any one；
and it is usually implied that the purpose is son； request or petition．And this is sornetime： here，expressed by 2 preposition，as èvép． also in Polyp．iv．76．Theophr．Char． 1. Wisd．viii．21，xvi．28．\＆véruxou rệ Kupico
 Rose on Parkh．in v．
25．ката入аßо́дкуов］＇having discovered
26．$\tau$ Te Kupiop］Render，＇to［my］Severe A title of the Emperors，corresponding to Roman Dominus，which is said to have bet jected as invidious by Augustus and Tit （though that would seem to be a mistai regards the latter，if we may judge from $\mathrm{Ph}_{\mathrm{h}}$ Fab．ii．3．（speaking of Tiberius）Perambu leta Domino viridia）．It had afterward－ taken up by succeeding Emperors，thous stances of its use so early as this are vern Its being used in conversation is much than if it had occurred in any public $u$ This force of Kúpios by which it mean－ reign is，I conceive，communicated 1 Article，which is taken Kat＇${ }^{\prime} E \circ \times{ }^{2} y$, to the supreme Lord．So an Inscription fo Smyrna：Kail ס̈бa dтeтúxомен тараі т． pion Kaíapoos＇Aд́pıayoū．
－dyaxpícecos］This does not denot． gular trial，but a previous examination i to trial；a sense often found in the $\mathbb{C}$ from whom Grot．adduces several exam Schleusn．refers to Taylor on Demosth and cites 3 Macc．vii．4．\＆עєu scions news

XXVI．1，diжe入oүeito］In this is
 graphicè，such being the attitude fa speech．
 have a very fine tро日eрктеvars（or
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conciliation），as the antient Rhetoricians called it，such as we find also at xvii．22．Thucyd．i．68， \＆iii． 54.
3．$\gamma \boldsymbol{\sim}$ which are，indeed，found in some MSS．but by gloss．The Commentators regard $\gamma$ vaiornv orrd $\sigma \in$ as Accusatives absolute，of which they adduce examples．See also Elmsl．on Eurip． Heracl． 693 ．It is perhaps as well to account for them on the principle of anacoluthon．By the ${ }^{6} \theta \eta$ are meant the institutes，laws，and rites of the Jews；and by the Yørimara，questions which arose upon the interpretation of those laws \＆c．That this compliment was not un－ merited has leen shown at large by Lardner．
－макроөímos］＇patiently．＇See xxiv． 4. It is judiciously observed by Chrysost．that he
 since he was soing to speak of himself，（which is always invidious，）and was about to deliver a somewhat long speech．

4．$\beta$ itwoiv］＇mode of life．＇A word occurring no where else but in the Preface to Ecclus．：$\delta_{1 \alpha}$ тท̄s ivyónov Btwícecos．and in Ps．38．6．Symm． Blwouy may be rendered＇quod attinet ad vitam；＇ on which see Matth．Gr．Gr．
5．日pnoкєias］religion，as in James i．27．The word，like daıfıठaıмоvia，was，however，mostly used by the Classical writers to denote super－ stition．
 not agreed on what is meant by the $\left\langle\lambda \pi i \delta_{s}\right.$ ．Two opinions are maintained with almost equal pro－ bability $;$ and no abrupt are the transitions in the style of St．＇＇aul，that here，as not unfrequently， we have no advantage from the connexion and context，which are usually our best guides．By intidt Chrysost．and most of the earlier modern Commentators understand the hope of the resur－ rection of the dead．So Grot．，Hamm．，Whitby， Pearce，Dordr．，Newc．，and others，who appeal to Acts xxiii．6．xxiv．15．But almost all the later Commentators，as Michaelis，Wakef．，Kuin． \＆cc．，think this refuted by v．7．and explain it of the Messiah．Whitby ap．Recens．Synop．，in－ deed，strenuously encounters this interpretation； but not，I conceive，successfully．At least this cannot be meant exclusively；for，as Mr．Scott cays，＂it is certain that the promise of a Re．
deemer was the moat prominent part of the reve－ lation made unto Abraham，Isaac，and Jacob， and the grand subject of prophecy；while the doctrine of the resurrection was not so fully re－ vealed in the O．T．as in the New．＂See the references of that Commentator．＂Thus the resurrection of Jesus（continues he）demon－ strated that he was the promised Messiah，against all the unbelieving Jews；and the doctrine of the resurrection，against the Sadducees．The latter were instigated to persecute the Apostles， for＂preaching through Jesus the resurrection of the dead ；＂（iv．1－3，xxiii．6－10．）the former， for preaching the very person whom they had crucified，as the Messiah，and as risen and＂ex－ alted to be a Prince and Saviour．＂Yet the whole nation expected a Messiah；and all，ex－ cept the Sadducees，professed to believe the doctrine of the resurrection．In general，all that remained of the twelve tribes，wherever dispersed，hoped for the accomplishment of the promise concerning the Messiah，and a resur－ rection to eternal life through him．＂It may be added，that though the principal meaning of en ets must be the promise of the Messiah，yet that included the promise of the resurrection of the dead by His means，as it was proved to have been fulfilled in Jesus Christ＇s fising from the grave ：and as His resurrection was the pledge and proof of our own，it may here be admitted as a secondary sense，especially when St．Paul adds here（as at xxiii．4）xspl to d $\lambda \pi$ tioos（i．e．for the object of which hope）dyкa入oū $\mu a t$（wid Tivy Iowdalonv．
7．Reoderad Jewish nation，＇at which we may supply 20 vos ； but it is very much like the rd ＂Eス入ฑyundy in Thucyd．
8．$\tau i$ ；ditcoron－dyeipet；］：What！is it judged by you as a thing incredible，that God is to raise the dead？＇The older Commentators take the $T 1$ for did $T t$ ，why？But the punctua－ tion $\tau \boldsymbol{l}$ ；found in the Greek Scholiasts，han been adopted by the best Commentators from Bera downwands；and rightly；since it is far more spirited，and agreeable to the style of St．Paul． See Rom．iii．9．vi．15．The el may be rendered siquidem，＇if［as is the case］；＇a sense often found both in the Classical and the Scriptural















writers．The force of the argument is this： ＂You will not deny that God can raise the dead； why then deny that Jesus can have been raised， and thus be proved to be the Messiah．＂
 abrupt，and the connexion disputed．The best interpretation seems to be that which I proposed in Recent．Synop．：And remember，however positive you may be in your opinion，and how－ ever you may act according to the dictates of your conscience，you may be mistaken，and your conscience deceived．$I$ ，for instance，thought with myself，was self－persuaded，that I ought
 fined，however，to the first person，and almost always the present tense）of which many ex－ apples are adduced by Wets．$\Delta \in \bar{\iota} \nu-\pi \rho \tilde{a} \xi \alpha$ ． The phraseology is idiomatical，（of which many examples are adduced by Wets．）and may be rendered＇that I was bound in many ways to oppose the doctrine of Jesus．＇
10．$\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ dyicov］＇the Christians．＇The name the disciples then bore among themselves．Tiv tgougiav，i．e．the power［which I held］．＇Avar－ poumévap aust $\bar{\omega} \nu$ ．The sense is，＇when they were being put to death；＇for trial was，it seems， equivalent to execution．It is not necessary， with many recent Commentators，to suppose this spoken with reference to St．Stephen only，and consequently a Rhetorical or Oratorical ample－ fiction；for though no other execution but Stephen＇s is recorded in the N．T．，yet，as Dodder．， Hasselaar，and Heine．have shown，there is reason to think that many did occur，to which there are at least allusions．See viii．1．ix．31． xxii．4．Kaтiverкa $\psi$ ijqov is，as the best Commentators are agreed，to be taken，not in its full sense（for Paul was not a member of the Sanhedrim）but metaphorically of consenting to and approving of what was done．Of this
examples are adduced by the Commentaic from the Classical writers．
－кат $\alpha \pi d \sigma a s$ rae $\sigma v \nu$ ．］This is mention as being the place where the punishment wa： flicted．Mo入入áкis rimøpōn should be rend． ＇by chastising them continually．＇Bגaбфпu i．e．the name of Christ，and thus abandon Christian religion and apostatize．That this then done we learn from this passage and 1 Exist．xiii．97．cited by Grot．And that it still more practised afterwards，we find Euseb．H．E．vi．34．and a Homily of $\mathrm{Hi}_{i}$ lotus cited by Pricæus．
 expression，which may be rendered and th ceedingly infuriate against them．＇＇Email． is very rare；yet it is formed regularly
 cities；referring to Damascus，though $n$ we may imagine，to Damascus only．See supra v． 9 ．
 used this expression occasionally，thouki frequently $\mu \in \sigma=\nu$ म $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho a s$, or $\mu \in \sigma o u ́ \sigma \eta s$ ，is by Abresch in loc．On this verse up i． See Note on ix． 5 ．sqq．

16．duáo $\eta_{\eta} \theta_{1}$ Namely，as ready to ． my mandates．This，indeed，was mean I courage Saul．
－трохесіба⿱日at．］Sub．cis Tó．II signifies to select，and，by implication，to ： ＇ranpci minister of what he has seen，though he $n$ witness，Markl．，with the Vulgate Tr： places a comma after ixeférvy．The however，is not quite essential to this $s$ e it would only be necessary to keep is न 1 tinct from dy Te cites．Nay，as eIvae understood both at uixทp．and páfo1 propriety requires that there should，













comma．＇ranpérnv must be taken，by virtue of the context，to mean＇my minister．＇So in Rom．xv．16．Paul，adverting，as it seems，to this very circumstance，says it was done els rd

－in re ciofs－oos］The construction is rather unusual ；but not such as to warrant the conjectures of Castalio and Markl．The first wy is for exciveos \＆̈．；（see $x \times i i .15$ ．）and the second
 mean revelabo tibi，as Mor．，Rosenm．，Schleus．， and Guin．suppose．Nor is there any reason to abandon the common interpretation，＇I shall be seen，or revealed，＇i．e．will reveal myself to thee；（see ls．xxx．2．）which may be understood 1．of the personal appearance of Christ to Paul； 2．of the revelations which were vouchsafed to him．The latter，however，is the more import－ ant sense．

17．éEatpoúnevós］．The older Commentators explain this＇delivering from，＇as vii． 10 \＆c 34. xii．11．xxiii．27．Gal．1．7．But that significa－ Lion is not very agreeable to the context，and， therefore，most of the later Interpreters rightly explain it＇choosing，＇separating for myself；＇ a signification occurring in Deut．xxxii．11．Job xxxvi．21．Is．xlviii．16．xlix．7．and often in the Classical writers．This is very suitable to the context；for thus it would be a further un－ folding of the sense at xpoxecpioaotal of ix－ perry．And it is confirmed by what was said by the Lord to Ananias：oxevos dix iotty ouror tout paotdoat \＆c．The sense therefore is，chasing，selecting thee both out of the Jews and Gentiles．＇
－cis ours］This may be understood both of the Jews and the Gentiles．But the words which follow are far more applicable to the latter；which interpretation is confirmed by the words y uv aंжoot．；for it appears that Paul was for many years of the earlier part of his ministry employed in Heathen countries．See Galat．1．17．sega．

18．тiotel els $i_{\mu e ́}$ ．］The older Commenta－
tors construe these words with riyıa⿱一𫝀口́yous， misled，as often，by the Vulg．The best of the later Commentators，however，have seen that they must be taken with $\lambda$ a $\beta$ civ．And this is confirmed by the Peahito Syr．Version；and even Beta and Scott，Calvinists though they be，admit this．
22．＂Bornka］Several recent Commentators take this to mean＇I am safe，＇as referring to the
 signification they establish on several passages both of the Scriptural and Classical writers． Those，however，will only prove that such may be the sense here，if the context permit it．But I conceive that it rather requires the common interpretation，＇I continue，＇or persist，as＂oтriкa крьnouevor at v．6．and Hebr．xiI．and Acts．i．11． Besides，this is required by the maprupónevor following．
 oujda doris［גкеivesv］\＆oi троф．db．$\mu \in \lambda$－
入óvten is drawn to $\mu$ ג入入ovra by the $\dot{s} y$ ．I have，for $\mu а \rho т ч \rho o u ́ \mu e y o s, ~ e d i t e d ~ \mu а р т ч p o ́ \mu ө v o s, ~$ with many MSS．，early Fd．，and Editors ；as also agreeably to the usage of the N．T．，in which（as Rinck observes）paptupeĩotas has always a passive，and mapripeotal a deponent sense．And 80 also in the Classical writers，as Thucyd．vi． 80.
23．il тaӨทTds \＆cc．］The Interpreters are agreed that al is for 8 rt，nempe quod．But it may signify＇seeing that［supply by those writings］： This is confirmed by the sense of ma0rrds，which is best rendered＇must suffer．＇So Lu．xxiv． 25. oi taüta ìdeı ma0өĩv тdy X．Schleus．ac－ knowledge that it may be rendered＇qui peri debet．＇BE dvaनт．עexpळiv may be rendered either＇after the resurrection from the dead，＇or， ＇by the resurrection；＇but the former is prefer－ able，and is confirmed by i．18．and 1 Cor．xv． 25. $\$$ wis may be understood，not of light，i．e．know－ ledge，but its concomitant，happiness，and sal－ ration．















24. maivp] The more recent Commentators are generally of opinion, that this means no more than 'Thou art a visionary enthusiast!' of which sense of maivecoat they adduce several examples from the Classical writers. But the words following, т $\underset{\alpha}{ } \pi 0 \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}-\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \rho$ érec will not admit this sense; and, therefore, the common interpretation, 'thou art mad,' which is with reason defended by Kuin., must be retained. It has always been the common notion that devoted attention to mental pursuits tends to madness ; in illustration of which Wets. and Kypke adduce many passages from the Classical writers, as Lucian Solæc. 3. oò dè únd Tîs äyay таıdeias дıєp日ópas. Petron. 48. Scimus te pro literis fatuum esse. Targ. Jonath. on Numb. xxii. 5. Bileam-quid insanus esset ob multitudinem sapientix sux. See also Joh. $x$. 20 .
 ing. It is strange that many recent Commentators should take $\gamma \rho d_{\mu \mu a \tau a}$ for $\beta \dot{\beta} \lambda_{1 a}$, i. e. the sacred books of the Jews. See the refutation of this in Recens. Synop. Els maviay $\pi \in \rho t$ T $\rho$ etret, 'is setting or driving thee to madness.' It may be observed that these words of Festus interrupted the thread of the Apostle's reasoning; for there is little doubt that he would have otherwise proceeded to allege some particular proofs from the Prophets of what he had said.
25. бwфpocív ${ }^{5}$ ] 'sanity of mind.' So Phavorin. мavia divtiкeital owфpoбivy. And Mark xv. uses $\sigma$ wфpoyév as opposed to $\delta a t-$ мор!豸омешоя.
26. Oív $\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ dotcv $\dot{d} \nu$ youvía \&c.] This seems to have been a proverbial manner of speating, in which $\dot{d} \nu \gamma \omega \nu i a$ is for $\dot{d} \nu \kappa p \nu \pi \tau \bar{\varphi}$. Wets. adduces examples of $\dot{\ell}$ ywoia $\kappa \alpha^{\alpha} \theta \eta \mu a \iota$ from the Greek, and in angulo jacere from the Latin writers.
27. सเotcúets-öтt $\pi$ toreviecs] This use of an interrogation immediately followed by the answer, is found in the best orators, many examples of which are adduced by Grot. and Pricmus.
 of these words Commentators are not agreed. It
is the opinion of all that there is an ellipsis at $\delta \lambda i \gamma \varphi$; but of what, they are not agreed. If there be ainy ellip. at all, (which may be doubted, ) :!
 p. 172. The sense here must be ' within a litule. or almost, though the phrase usually signifies in a short time.' Yet one example of the othe: sense is adduced by Grot. from Plato, to wher I would add Thucyd. i. 18. Whether Agripp. was serious in what he said the Commentaton are not agreed. The earlier ones think he wabut the later ones generally that he was not, a.-. they suppose the words to have been utter sarcastically. For this last notion, hower. there is no ground. I am inclined to think, $w$ : Markl., that the words were merely a civil sper pronounced in that complimentary insincer into which good natured, easy, and unscrupule persons, like Agrippa (as he is characterized Josephus) are apt to run. Besides, it is unlik. that any strong impression could have bu made so soon; or that, if made, Agrippa wou have interrupted the Apostle, and then left 1 almost as abruptly as Eelix had done, or Pilate our Lord, without waiting to hear the conclu: of his sentence. This, no doubt, arose from Apostle's having become (as Markl. obsery more particular in his application to Agri concerning religion than he liked.
29. iv mo $\pi \lambda{ }^{\circ} \%$ ] There has been some dc as to the sense here; but (as the best Comr tators are agreed) the context determines i be 'altogether;' though it would be difficul find another example of that signification. may, however, account for it from there b a play upon $\dot{d} y \delta \lambda i \gamma \varphi$. And this seizing or words of another, and giving them a tur favour of our own cause (which marks an orator) often requires a slight detortion of sense of a word or phrase. Mapecists $\tau$. Spoken deuxtux ${ }^{\circ}$, holding out his chains. proves that St . Paul was then not (as some
 militari, chained to the soldier who guन him.
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 $5 \pi \rho o v$ ，dıà tò tous àvémous cival évavtious．tó te $\pi e ́ \lambda a \gamma o s$
are omitted in a few MSS．and Versions，and are therefore cancelled by Griesb．；but rashly． For the external evidence for this is trifling，and the internal not favourable；since there can be no doubt but that in MISS．and Versions words and short clauses are omitted which seem not essential to the sense．

31．трáनбet］for тéxpaxe，the Commentators say ；which is confirmed by the antient Versions． It should seem that the Present is used in order to express continuity of action．So the Apostle
 Өavátov тéxpaxá тı．See also Joh．viii． 68. 1 Joh．iv．17．and Win．Gr．Gr．§ 34．2．c．

32．el $\mu \eta$ dтекéклпто K．］．For thus（as Grot． remarks）the power of the judge，whether for acquittal，or condemnation，had ceased，and the cognizance of the cause rested solely with the superior．

XXVII．1．\＆кpi $\theta_{\eta}$ ］＇was determined．＇Name－ ly，by the decision of Agrippa and Festus，that Paul must be sent to Italy．It would，indeed， seem that $\pi \lambda$ eiv might have been better；but， in fact，there seems to be a blending of two sen－ tences，namely：＂As so0n as it was decided that we must go，＂and＂as soon as our immediate voyage was determined．＂The roü may be ren－ dered quod attinet ad，＇as soon as the thing was determined＇\＆c．；and there may be，as some think，an ellip．of repl．
－тареdidovy $]$ Namely，ol Jeбмофú入axes； which is better than taking it，with Kuin．，in an impersonal sense；since that principle is not to be resorted to unnecessarily．
－oteípys $\sum e \beta$ ．］From the time of Augustus Octavianus legions took the name Augustan． Thus in Claudian Bell．ix．422．mention is made of a legio Augusta．Hence many Commenta－ tors are of opinion that，as in all the other legions，so in the five cohorts stationed at Cesa－ rea，there was one cohort called the Augustan； or that the cohort here mentioned was a legionary cohort of an Augustan legion stationed in Syria and Judaa．
2．т入oíc＇Adрaц．］As we say＂a London vessel，＂＂Liverpool vessel，＂\＆c．Adramytum
was in Mysia opposite to Lesbos，whither，it seems，the ship was bound．The Centurion， however，seems to have intended not to remain with the vessel to its place of final destination， but only to some point of Asia Minor from which he might meet with a convenient passage to Italy，expecting to find some ship in the ports of Lycia or Caria，on board of which he might em－ bark his soldiers and prisoners for Rome．The event answered his expectation ；for at Myra in Lycia he found an Alexandrian vessel bound for Italy．
－мe八入ovres］Several of the best MSS．and Versions have $\mu e \lambda \lambda$ ovrt，which is preferred by Mill，Beng．，and Pearce，and edited by Griesb． and Knapp，with the approbation of Kuin．，who
 was made in accommodation to exrefáver $^{\text {pre－}}$ ceding and duri $x^{0} \eta \mu e \nu$ following．That，how－ ever，is too hypothetical；and the reading $\mu e \lambda$－入ourt looks like a mere emondation，to improve which，others supplied els or $\& \pi i$ ．The reading of other MSS．，Meג入orros，confirms the com－ mon reading ；being evidently a mere error of the scribes．No change is necessary；for the scope of the words $\mu \lambda \lambda \lambda$ ovres－rósovs seems to have been to assign a reason why they went on boand this Adramyttian ressel；namely，because they had to coast the［southern］part of Asia； for that is the sense of $\pi$ 入eiv \＆c．Me入入ortes may very well be rendered intending，or being bound，as we say．Wets sives many examples of the phrase то́тоt ката́ тiv＇Afiay，or＇Ita－ Alày，or any other maritime country．

3．dxime入eias ruxeiv］＇to receive their kind attention．＇

4．íтबтлeúvauey miv K．\＆c．］The Com－ mentators have been not a little perplexed with these，and the words at v．5．as far as biamतev－ ravres．And that，chiefly from ignorance of the nautical term ix orneiv，and partly from in－ attention to the situation of the places men－ tioned．Now in sailing from Sidon to the coast of Lycia，it is probable，that had the weather been fair，they would have taken a course to the South of Cyprus，but not nearing its shores，ox－
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cept at the S．W．promontory，$z_{\text {ephyrium，and }}$ thence struck across to Rhodes，or the coast of Caria．As，however，we are told，the winds were contrary，viz．though varying，yet all more or less advense，they changed that course and їтет入єúन．тij K．Now，for the winds to be contrary，they must have been N．or N．E．，or N．N．E．，or such like．And then the best way to evade their force would be to sail close under the coast of Cyprus，after having cut across to the promontory of Pedalium so as to reach the bay of Cutium．That they coasted along Pales－ tine，and then made for the Eastern promontory of Cyprus（as the best Commentators think）is improbable，because they would thus be brought more into the wind＇s eye（as the sailors say）and tempestuous seas．At all events，it is plain that ixomicin must mean to sail under the lee of any high land（such as is Cyprus）so as to get shelter from it．From Zephyrium it is plain they crossed over（ঠıеп入é́rravto）to Myra in Lycia，a port of great celebrity，and，as appears from a pas－ sage of Porphyry cited by Wets．，the port gene－ rally used in passing from Cyprus to Lycia or Caria，as also in the passage from Egypt to Lycia．

6．xतoiov］Here，as often in the Classical writers，the word denotes a ship of burden；and such，it appears，the Alexandrian corn vessels were：and this was probably one，（see v．38．）for it is not certain．See Recens．Synop．Myra is indeed out of the track to Dicsarchia in Italy； but the winds had been contrary，and the ship had made for the Lycian coast for shelter．

7．Bpadvnतooūעтєs］The verb is rare；but an example is cited by Wets．from Artemid．，to which may be added others from Cosmas Indic． 133．in Bekker＇s Anecd．i．225．Kata K．，＇over
 גivémov．Пробєс̄̀ттоs presents some difficulty， to remove which，Markl．would read m pórw dionvtos．J3ut that is unnecessary ；for the com－ mon reading may have the very same sense， $\pi \rho o \sigma$ in composition being often used for $\pi \rho \dot{\sigma} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$ ； and I would refer to the passages of Sophocl．， Eurip．，and Diod．，cited by me in Recens．Synop． Thus the sense is，＇not letting us make any pro－ gress．＇I have，however，sometimes thought that the true reading might be rробш日oüytos． So Hor．Od．iv．12，3．Impellunt anime lintea Thraciz．＇ $\mathbf{r}$ тєт入évoamev．The sense is，＇we ran under，＇i．e．made for Crete at Salmon，and coasted along the island．This they did，thinking they should get more into the wind．

8．таралеүópevol］＇doubling it．＇The wind might be adverse；and doubling promontories was to the antients a long and difficult affair． and usually effected，if we may judge from the term here employed，by towing，the mapamieir áxd «á入co of Thucyd．iv．25．Ka The place，which was only a port to the town just afterwards mentioned，still bears the same name Calos Limenas．
— गे mòis Lafaía］Not＇was the city of Lasæa，＇but＇was a city or town called Lassa． Of this we find no mention in the Classical wri－ ters．Hence the Commentators either resort to conjectures，or suppose this one of the towns of the hundred－citied isle not mentioned by the geographers or other writers．This，however， is cutting the knot．I rather suspect that Lay is meant，which occurs in Pling＇s list of the in land towns；and Lasma was，it is plain，surl． Fair－Havens was its port．The difference is tr： fling；since mó ${ }^{\prime}$ เs Ravaia means the city Lasos．And this is confirmed by Hesych．Aavir－ ró入ıs，$\hat{\eta}$ Xeopiov．where read Aacalcon．T！ situation of fair－Havens is，by the modern tern being discovered，fixed to a place a litule to $t$ N．E．of Cape Leon，the present C．Mata Lassea is supposed to be on the brow of the hil which rise about 4 miles from the shore．
 strange that $\nu \eta$ oreiay should have so perplex Erasm．，Casaubon，Castalio，Le Moyn，is Markl．，as to have led them to suppose it rupt，and to propound various emendations． unnecessary．Bp．Middl．notices the absur of Markland＇s reasoning，without，howe＇ being aware that it was borrowed at sec， hand from Erasm．and Casaub．The true v seems to be that of Chrys．and GEcumen．，adoy by Pisc．，Beza，Rosenm．，Midull．，and Kx who observe，that Luke designates the time the manner of the Jews，and means a ct： season of the year，so called from the great which fell at that time；just as we spea Christmus，Lady－day，Michaelmas，\＆tc．，wh we be Protestants or Romanists．And thi－ usual to the Heathens．So Thucyd．ii． 78. ＇Apкто⿱㇒́口ои＇̇лıтодás＇where see my （Transl．）Theophr．Ch．Eth．3．Triv Oá入a eк $\Delta$ sovvaíon त्रोcoímov civas．The Article
 cited by Loesn．speaks of it by the nann． גеуонévŋע עпотeíav．meaning the day of tion，the great Fast on the tenth of the Tisri，about the tenth of October．Ti












would render，＇because that even the Fast was now past．＇
10．ïßpeas］Grot．，Wets．，Kjpke，and Kuin． rightly explain this injury；comparing Joseph．
 22，58．$\theta a \lambda \alpha \tau \tau \eta s$ ïßpıv．And so injuria in the Latin．Grot．observes that $0 \beta \rho$ os respects the persons；Y Yuia the goods；comparing Philo． $\eta \eta i a \quad$ хр $\eta \mu d \tau \ldots y$ ．When Paul speaks of the loes of lives，it is plain that he had had no reve－ lation on that head，and only speaks as a permon of experience in navigation，and with a reference to human probability．See Bp．Pearce．
 were distinct persons，on the nature and dif－ ference of whose duties I have copiously treated in Recens．Synop．，adducing a great body of proofs and illustrations from the Classical wri－ ters．Suffice it here to say，that the former term denoted the master，the latter the supercargo． But it was only large merchant ships，like this， that had both．The smaller had but one person for both offices，who was then called vaúxג $\quad$ pos． The киßори．is here mentioned frst，because，as I have proved ubi supra，it was customary to yield to his opinion．

12．Mpde mapax．］Put for apder тd mapa－ xemajsey．The word occurs in Polyb．and Diod．＇E日erro Bou入riy，statuerunt consilium． Eitues dóy．．＇［to try］if they could．＇An ellip． is frequent in the best writers．Els $\Phi$ ofyica，＇to Phoenix＇（not Phoenice）；the present port Sphacia．From its description（with which I would compare Pausan．v．25，2．dкрау тeтра $\mu$－
 （irot．and Schmid．think）infer that the port was crooked，with two jutting horns，which looked to the sea to the S．W．and N．W． respectively．

13．Tijs т poteí．кexp．］had ，［as it were already］attained their purpose．＇Wets．ad－ duces two examples of the phrase from Polyb． －deayrss］The Commentators generally supply d $\gamma \kappa \dot{v} \rho a \nu$ ，which is often expressed，as in several passages cited by Wets．This term， however，may also allude to the raising the masts，which were usually lowered on shore． So in Thucyd．vii．26．dpas ix rise Alyings． the Schol．supplies tia ioria．Yet，after all，
 （on which see Note）it should seem that St．

Luke intended Tivy vaûy to be supplied；which is confirmed by Thucyd．i．52．Tàs vaüs dpavter $\alpha \pi \delta \gamma{ }^{\eta} s$ ．where，had the Commentators remem－ bered this passage of St．Luke，they would not have conjectured aj$\gamma$ vupas ；since 1 have there shown that when yaiv is expressed or under－ stood，the phrase has respect to what we call heaving ship，or leaving a port where she had been drawn on shore．And it should seem that in this case the ship had been got into port as they were deliberating whether to winter there， or not．
－$\dot{\sigma} \sigma \sigma 0 \nu$ ］With this word the Commentators have been perplexed．I have in Recens．Synop． fully proved that there is no need to resort to conjectures．The word is used by the best writers，not only poets，but prose writers ；as Herodot．iv．3．vii．233．Joseph．Ant．i．20，1．xix． 2，4．Hippocrates，Plutarch \＆c．It signifes，not noarer，but cery near，and here answers to our nautical term in shore，and，as sailors say，to near the shore．Thus the phrase $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \frac{1}{\text { mapa }}$ $\lambda$ éreotal signifies to coast along close in shore． The mariners were probably proceeding partly by their oars，（for the wind was only a side wind， and of little use）and partly by being toved， which was called jupou入keītat，and has been copiously illustrated by me on Thucyd．iv． 25.

14．aürins］It is debated to what this has re－ ference．Some suppose to $\pi \rho o \theta^{\prime} \dot{\sigma}$ eos，others to xpajpas．But that is too arbitrary an ellip．It is better，with most eminent Commentators，to refer it to K $\mathrm{pri} \boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ．That，however，yields a frigid and inept sense．I would take it to mean the ship itself，with reference to paüp just before left to be supplied at dंpayres．This is confined， and the force of ipa入e（which is wrongly ren－ dered by Toup disconcerted ）illustrated by Pind．

 dкatoy elva入lay．
－àvenos тuфquisdr］i．e．a wind like a Tu中 ${ }^{2} y$ ，the name then，and to the present day， given to a tempestuous wind prevailing in the Mediterranean，and blowing a sort of hurricane in all directions from N．E．to S．E．；and per－ haps the very kind of storm meant by Homer Odyse．C．313．and Virg．E．n．i．103－12．The word is，I think，wrongly derived by the Etymo． logints from tiow，fumo；it rather comes from





тú $\phi$, cognate with rúxco and тúxrem，and pro－ perly signifies the Striker ；which is confirmed and illustrated by Aischyl．637．Blomf．Naüs





It remains，however，to discuss the yet more difficult word Eúpoonúdon，which has so per－ plexed Commentators and Critics，that they have anxiously sought a change of reading，either from the MSS．and Versions，or from the conjectures of the learned．Dr．Bentley urges various objec－ tions to the common reading，of no great weight． As to the chief objection，the incongruity of the compound，I answer，that $\kappa \lambda$ údwy may signify not only a wave，but a rough vavy sea，（See the examples in Steph．Thes．）and must have been sometimes used as an adjective，（which indeed， I suspect，was its original form）as appears from the adjective＇E $\rho \iota \kappa \lambda$ viown，which is used by a later Greek writer ap．Steph．Thes．Of the emendations which have been proposed the only ones that merit attention are Ėupuk入údos and Eujaxú $\boldsymbol{c}_{\infty} \boldsymbol{y}$ ．For the furmer（which has been supported by Toup，Ernesti，Bryant，and Kuin．） there is no authority at all．And 2dly，the com－ pound would not be analogical；since there is no instance of evov with a substantive；and even those with adjectives are almost confined to the Poets．3dly．The sense yielded（wide－wavy）is too feeble．For the latter，（namely Ejpaxùico， N．N．E．wind ）which has been adopted by Grot． Mill，Le Clerc，Bentley，and Beng．，there is some，though but very slender，authority in MSS． and Versions：while the objections against it are 1．that it would not be formed analogically，but ought to be Eujoaxúdcon．2．That it would be he－ terogeneously compounded of Greek and Latin． And dxúdcos could not well represent aquilo． Hesides，the name was doubtless the same which had prevailed for centuries，and was therefore not likely to be otherwise than Greek throughout， not Greek and Latin．3．It would not at all correspond to the accurate descriptions of the тиф $\omega^{\prime} \nu$ ，or Tuffone，given by antients and mo－ derns，who agree in representing it not as a point－wind，but as shifting about in all quarters from N．E．to S．E．，East prevailing．Hence it is clear that both external and internal evidence unite in requiring the common reading to be retained，the sense of which may be thus repre－ sented，＇the wave－stirring Easter，＇or，literally， ＇East－souser；＇which is confirmed and illustrated by the numerous passages of the Greek and Latin Classical writers adduced by me（chiefly from Wets．）in Recens．Synop．

15．ov acotaöévtos toû $\pi \lambda o i o v]$ An expres－ sion often used of tempestuous winds，as is proved by the examples adduced by the Com－ mentators，to which may be added Eschyl． Agam．610．$\chi \in \bar{i} \mu a-i j \rho \pi a \sigma e$（scil．aữdע．）＇Ay－ тoфөa入川eiv，to face the wind（as our seamen
say）i．e．to turn the ship＇s head to the wind．
 as many Commentators suppose；or rather of $\dot{\text { ciutoús；which latter is confirmed by Lucian }}$



 бípŋбav．The sense of غферо́ре $\theta a$ is＇we were driven or shifted ；＇for the Greeks say фépeodas $\kappa \alpha \tau \dot{\alpha} \kappa \bar{v} \mu \alpha \kappa \alpha l \dot{\alpha} \nu \in \mu o \nu$.

16．íroঠpanóvтes］Not＇running up to，＇bet ＇sunning under，＇i．e．close under shore．So Themist．p．152．cited by Wets．：$\tau \alpha^{\top} \mu \hat{\mu} \boldsymbol{p}$（partly） ілобранойбаь，та，ঠè（partly）теридранойбац，
 suprav． $4 \& 7$ ．K $\lambda a u ́ \delta \eta v$. The name given by Mela and Pliny countenances the reading Károgu found in some Versions \＆c．But the common reading is confirmed by Hierocl．ap．Ptolom． iii．7．and Athenzus．Пepiкратeis eivas，for тepixparciv，＇to become masters of，＇＇secure the boat，＇which，it seems，whether it had been towed by a rope，or had hung fastened to the ship，（which a passage of Cicero cited by Kuin． would countenance）or been on deck，had been washed away by the waves．

17．© apavres］＇having heaped up into the ship．＇
 sage has occasioned no litue perplexity to the Commentatos，who are not agreed on the sens
 or the united help of the mariners and the soldien or other passengers．Others take it of thos． ropes，hooks，chains，\＆c．by which assistance if rendered to a ship in rough weather．No proo： however，of this signification has been adducer！ As to ixoy．，both the above classes of Inter preters are agreed that it must be taken of th． undergirding which there is reason to think wis employed by the antients as well as the modern． by which thick cables were drawn round rickety ship，to keep the timbers tight togethe： In proof and illustration of this the Comme， tators（especially Wets．）adduce a great numl． of passages from the Classical writers．13： upon close examination，it will appear（av have in some measure shown in Recens．Syricy that scarcely any one（perhaps not one）of the is to the purpose；for the sinefuxibus Vix dur： carina Possint imperiosius zquor of Hora． Od．i．14．is uncertain，as may be imagine since no Commentator except Baxter takes it refer to the undergirding of a ship with roy And although in llesych．in voc．\}ooné́reataz have the gloss $\sigma$ Xoıvía катג Mé天on tris ঠєоцєvó $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} a$, （for so I would there point） that is known to refer to Aristoph．Eq．279， is only the opinion of a Grammarian on sense of the word there，which is better explai by the Scholiasts，by Suidas，and even by anol
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Toiv vecin, which is far more agreeable to the context and the subject. And this is confirmed by the Schol. on Thucyd. i. 29. Eeúgaveres ( $\nu a \dot{u} s$ ), where he speaks of these $\xi \dot{u} \lambda a$, calling them Yuywíata, as stuys necessary to bind together a rickety ship's hull. And so Theogn.

 sages, and I will venture to say all the passages that have been adduced in proof or illustration of the above undergirding belong, in fact, to this operation, which is alluded to in the passages just cited, and which may be called under (or inner) belting. The passages, indeed, of Appian are not quite decisive; but they are far better interpreted of inner-belting than undergirding, because the subject is refitting for the purpose of war. The passage of Polyb. admits of no other sense. Those of Plato, which are mere allusions, are far better so understood, because the term ix ǒajuara is employed. And however the antients might sometimes apply their cables in the above way, yet they would scarcely have cables made for the purpose, and called ixoरcimara. The passage of Athen. p. 204, however, is quite decisive, where he says that the gigantic, ship of Ptolemy Philopator had twelve ivoไธiмara, each 100 feet long. So also in the passage of Plutarch, which 1 have there myself adduced, there is mention of these inoऍょं $\mu a \tau \alpha$, said to be of brass. From what I have written on the passage of Thucyd. there can be no doubt but that the Yuycimara, or is serve as stays, to bind the inner frame work of a ship together, and were sometimes, in the case of an exceedingly large ship, put in at first, but usually after the ship had been some time in service, and had grown rickety. So Galen uses the term to denote the midriff, or diaphragm, which is the inner belting of the human body.

C'pon the whole, I conceive, I have fully proved that no other sense must be thought of in the present passage than that of forming an inner belfing. Another argument for which is this, that, according to the other interpretation, Bondeiats ¿xpairro, which occupies the most prominent place in the sentence, would be almost useless. At least we should expect ixe-
 in whichever of the two ways above detailed $\beta o \eta \theta$. be taken, it will be little suitable. I have no doubt but that the true sense of the word is that, in which, as Wets. attests, it is used in the Greck writers on Mechanics, namely props or stays, viz. the Yuya or Yuyoinara above mentioned. Thus the sense is, "they resorted to prope and stays, undergirding the ship [with them].' They had been, no doubt, provided for any such emergency; and there is reason to think that in the largest class of merchant ships carpenters were regularly employed. This was certainly the case in ships of war; for Xenoph.
de Republ. Athen. 12, enumerating the various officers on board a trireme, reckons the vauтท่yoı.

- Triv Eú $\rho \tau t \nu$ ] By this is, no doubt, meant the Syrtis major on the coast of Africa, estimated at $4 \times 00$ or 5000 stadia in circumference, and occupying the whole of what is now called the gulph of Sidra (a name formed from Syrtis.)
 by Td $\sigma \kappa \in \bar{v} o s$ the Commentators are not agreed. Some say the sails. But I have in Recens. Synop. shown that this sense cannot be admitted. Others take it to mean 'the anchor,' which was certainly part of the oweún. Yet they were not in soundings; and if they had been, they would have let down tuo, as v.29. If we consider what other $\% \pi \lambda$ on may deserve to be called the oxev̄os, we cannot doubt it must be the mast. And this signification is confirmed by the Syr. and adopted by Grot., Heraldus, Bolten, and Kuin. Xa入ăy is used, because the masts of the antients were so formed as to go in a socket, and be raised or lowered at pleasure. The sense seems to be, that they lowered both masts and every sort of instrumentum which carried any canvass.

18. ex expoliv ixotoürrc] "jactationem fecerunt,' cast out the lading; for of that $i_{x} \beta_{0} \lambda_{y}$ when used without any addition is to be understood, since the order of the circumstances (as Grot. rightly observes ) is, first, that the lading should be thrown overboard, as here ; then the tackling, v. 19 ; as lastly the procisions, as v.38. From the Classical citations of Wets. it appears that this jactutio was not very unfrequent in ancient navigation. And, in violent storms, not only frequent, but necessary, as the Classical citations of Wets. and Pric. prove, to which may be added the following passages. Jonas i. 5.
 Agam. 978. каi тd $\mu \lambda \nu$ трd хрпиdтсоу ктท-
 Oíx idv про́тas ঠónos. where for dónos I would read yópos. See also Theb. 767-9.
19. Tiy arevive] Synonymous with the axcúm at Jonas i. 5, and signifying all the armamenta navis, otherwise called $\delta \pi \lambda a$, as masts and yards, sails, ropes \&cc., (See Thucyd. vii. 24.) including the luggage of the passengers; for oxevi has sometimes that sense, as Thucyd. i. 10 .
20. $\mu$ rite $\delta \dot{\text { in }}$ ทíou-rimäs] This non-appearance of the sun and stars is almost always tound in tempestuous wreather; but what chiefly threw the ancients into despair when, on wide sea, under such circumstances was, not so much for the want of skill in navigation, as for their being mithout what Lord Byron finely calls "The feeting Compess-Navigation's soul.". In such situations, the antients quite lost their course, and knew not where they were.

- Xeıц. dтıкechévou] 'Brik. is a very significant term: and Wets. cites an example of


















 compares the Virgilian "tempestas incubuit silvis." See also Ps. xxxviii. 7.

21. ajotrias ] This is best rendered india, a neglect of food, for which they could not, in their present state, have either appetite or relish. See Ps. clii. 4.
 this seemingly strange expression, we need not, with many of the older Commentators, extend the $\mu \dot{\eta}$ to кepon̄бat, and explain it suffer; but we may have recourse to a sense of кepd. found in the best writers, on which I have fully treated in Recens. Synop. and on Thucyd. ii. 44, where I have shown that the ratio idiomatis is this. "It signifies to be a gainer by (quad) something. Thus we may here render; 'But it behoved you to have hearkened to me, and not to have loosed from Crete; and thus you would have been gainers by all this disgrace, (i.e. frustration) and this loss.'
 xioiou there is an clip. which may be thus supplied : ' [nor of any thing else] except the ship.'
22. oi] scil. $\delta o u ̈ \lambda o s$; as Exod. xxxii. 26. Who is the Lord's? and Levit. $x x$. 26 . So also in Is. x lv. 14, where the LXX. render wm by al
 serves, implies more, namely strenuous and active service.
 or rive in general signifies to grant any one's life for another;' and examples are adduced by the Commentators. Here, however, it seems meant, ' they are spared on thy account.'
23. Tєєбаребк.] Namely, from their having left Fair-havens. Dtaфep. $\eta \boldsymbol{j} \mu \bar{\omega} \nu$, 'as we were tossed up and down.' The word is almost confined to the later writers. 'Aspic. Not what is
now called the Adriatic gulph, but the Adriatic sen, which, as the Commentators have proved from Ptolemy, Strabo, \&c., comprehended what had originally been called the 'Ioviov menayor. and denoted the sea between Greece, Italy, and Africa. See my Note on Thucyd. i. 24. $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{i l}$ 'Ióvioy коллоу.

- трогव́yect тıvà aüroìs xci pay] There is here a nautical hypallage, like àaфау\&утes mic $\mathbf{K}$. at $\times x$ i. 3 , in either case originating in thu optical delusion, by which, on approaching 3 coast, the land seems to approach to the ship not the ship to the land. Of this examples ant adduced by the Commentators from both Gree and Latin writers. Nay our own seamen ha the same idiom. When they speak of nearing coast, and fetching a port.

28. 'dpyuid's] The word comes from ópé rotls and denotes the space that a man may comp by stretching out his arms to the farthest. It remarkable that almost all measures of lena that admitted of it were, by the ancients, deriv from certain parts of the body, e. gr. pes, $u$ in cubitus, uncial, passus.
29. tpaxeís tónous] 'rocky ground.' this expression two examples are adduced fr
 unusual it may now be for anchors to be drops from the stern of a ship, yet the passages add by Wets. and Peace show that such was v usual in antient times. And the former proved that even in modern times the s: custom continues in the ships plying bet Alexandria and Constantinople : also that anchors were thought necessary on occasion great peril and two ordinarily in a tempest night. H bx. j $\mu$. $\gamma$ cv. This has the air proverbial expression, of which Wets. cites, examples from Longus, signifying 'to anvil wish for day.'
























#### Abstract

30．фvyeiv ex roup miofov］Very usual to marines in such circumstances．＂In poфáбes， ＇with a pretence．＇At $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda$ о́vтшo sub．aúrcìv； an clip．usual when the participle is accom－ panied with an wis．

31．out dúvagoce ］i．e．humanly speaking．For the promise of safety was conditional，and in－ volved the obligation to use the ordinary means for preservation，to neglect which would have been tempting God． 33． $\boldsymbol{a}^{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{f} \boldsymbol{\rho}$ oi $]$ Beza well renders＇interim tum，＇q．d．meanwhile，to pass the time till day－ break． －тробסокш्रres］Namely，for the storm to cease．＂Avitol sıaтe入eite．A popular form of speaking，which denotes＂ye have taken little or no food，＂no regular meal．Examples are ad－ duced by Kypke from Josephus．II poo $\lambda \alpha \beta$ sodas signifies to take something to oneself．

34．т $\rho о ф \bar{\eta} \mathrm{~s}]$ Sub．т．．Toüto Yap \＆c．＇this will be promotive of your safety，$A$ sense of Mhos frequent in the best writers especially Thucyd．Oídevde rip \＆c．An Oriental and proverbial phrase，on which see Note at Matt． x．30．and Lu．xxi． 18.

37．ai $\pi \bar{a} \sigma a t$ ］＇in the whole．＇The number 286 may seem large；but the Alexandrian vessels， which were very bulky，were fitted up for carry－ ing a great number of passengers．Thus Joseph in Vit．C．3．cited by Pearce，says the ship in which he sailed，and which was cast away in the Adriatic sea，had 600 persons on board．

38．Tiv oitoy］The best Commentators are agreed that this must signify the provisions，


which would be reserved till the last，the lading and tackling being before thrown over board．

39．Tiv $\gamma^{\eta} \nu$ ours darer．］A brief mode of ex－ pression denoting they took a view of the country ；but recognised it not．＇Kó入тov－ ¿xovta alytaldy．As all inlets have shores， Schmid and Kain．construe the words thus：
 perceived a shore having a certain creek．＇This， however，is doing violence to the construction． We must retain the natural one，and take al $\gamma_{\text {．}}$ with Grot．，Math．，and Schleus．，in a popular sense，to denote a practicable shore．And in－ deed the passages cited by those Commentators prove that alyiands signifies properly a sandy shore，（as opposed to a rocky one）and conse－ quently one convenient for landing．Kódros is taken in a sense which Theophyl．says is usual in the common dialect，viz．an inlet．This is on the $\mathbf{N}$ ．W．side of the island，and now called La Cal di San Pablo．＇FENōat td $\pi$ גoioy，＇to strand the vessel．＇On this sense of＂Emociy， occurring in the best writers，see my Note on Thucyd．ii．90．（Transl．\＆Ed．）

40．गєpre入óytes ］This cannot mean，as several Commentators imagine，＇having taken up the anchors；＇for that sense would require due－入óvres，or dye入ópevol；nor，as they were with－ out boats，could they weigh the anchors ；but the sense must be，as the beat Interpreters ancient and modern are agreed，＇removed the anchors，＇ viz．by cutting the ropes and leaving them in the sea．And cicos must，with De Dieu，Wets．， Peace，Mark．，Schleus．，Heinr．，and Kuin．，







 тoù ßov入ท̀matos，éкé入evoé te toùs duvajévous ко入vцßầ，



be referred to the anchors，not to the ressel． This indeed is required by every rule of inter－ pretation．
 loosened the bands of the rudders．＇So Eurip． Hel．1536．speaks of the rudder as fastened Yєúg入atбt．Some Commentators are much per－ plexed with the circumstance of turo rudders to one ship．But Grot．，Bochart，Elsn．，Scheffer， Lips，and Perizon．have proved that among the antients large ships of burden had two rudders． Some of the passages cited are quite decisive； and I have in Recens．Synop．added a passage yet more apposite than any from Orpheus in Ar－


 $\sigma \phi i \gamma \xi \alpha \nu \tau 0$ ò $l_{\mu \bar{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu}$ ，from which passage it ap－ pears probable that the rudders were regularly taken off when the ship was in port，and were laid up in the docks．But the question is，how and where were they fixed on ？＇hat，however， is not very easy to determine．Many，as Alberti， Bp．Pearce，and Kuin，think that the rudders were one at the stern and the other at the bow of the ship．I know not，however，of the numerous passages cited by the above Commentators，any one that determines this point；but that from Orpheus ubi supra undoubtedly does；yet it decides the contrary way，namely that they were both at the трvuvi．
 scil．aüpa，signifies the breese，as is plain from passages of Lucian，Plutarch，and Heliodor． cited by Wets．＇ETḑpayres means hoisting， and is a term often applied to masts and sails． If applied to the masts，it has reference to the sail with which they are clothed．With respect to the term $\alpha \rho \tau \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \infty \nu$ ，it rarely occurs，is almost unnoticed by the antients，and hence its sense is disputed．Luther took it to mean the mast ；and Erasmus，the sail yard；interpretations devoid alike of proof and probability．Bayf．，Jun．， Alberti，and Wolf，with more probability，ex－ plain it the large sail of the poop，answering to our mizen sail，and even yet called by the Vene－ tians artemon．The best founded opinion，how－ ever，seems to be that of Grot．，Voss，Heum．， Wets．，Mich．，Rosenm．，and Kuin．，who under－ stand by it a small sai！near the prow called by Pollux the dolon，which was used to keep the
ship steady，and to prevent its working too much， when the larger and upper sails were set．See the important passages of Papius and Juvenal Sat．xiif．68．cited from Wets．in Recens．Synop． I would add that this was not the mizen mast sail at the poop，as is plain from Pollux．i． 93. who reckons three masts，the ó $\mu$ é $\gamma a s$ ，the ó
 roov or dó $\lambda \cos$ ．This was very short，like our Jury masts，and must have been at the bow，or fore－ship．
－кareīxov］scil．rriv vaûy；an ellipsis sometimes supplied in Homer and Herodot．
 oos has not here its usual signification an isthmus， which divides seas，but denotes a peninsular pro－ montory．The word，indeed，is usually applied to peninsulas of the largest size；but sometimes also to narrow spits of land jutting out into the sea；and anetimes to those tania，partly above and partly under water which guide the current－ and therefore make the place $\delta, \theta \alpha \alpha^{\prime} \lambda a \sigma \sigma o s$, and consequently rough．So Clemens．cited by Wet
 Orat．v．，who，speaking of the Syrtes，says it is
 tatviat，where he distinguishes the three sort－
 spits of sand under water ；3．rasyias，long necl of land jutting out and protruding above wates Nothing can be more to the present purpos The spit of sand in question was an elongation a ness，represented in Cluverius＇s Map，a noticed by Dorville in his Sicula．
－＇pelqaga］＇having fixed itself．＇On t＇ idiom by which words with an active force，a generally active use，have sometimes a refect sense，see my Note in Recens．Synop．W Eqeıvev dनa入evtos Pric．compares Virg．＂I saque prora pependit．

43．екелevae－$\rightarrow$ рafrous］i．e．bid those of prisoners who could awim to first cast themse＇ \＆c．Thus（as was very usual）making tria the danger at the expense of the least valu lives．＇Aroṕp．must be taken in a recip＇， sense．

44．oüs $\mu$ z̀ On which idiom see Matth．Gr．Gr．${ }^{\text {Brit }} \boldsymbol{T}$ $\tau \boldsymbol{\omega} \nu \mathrm{d} \pi \mathrm{T}^{2} \tau . \pi \lambda$ ．，＇some of the things $n$ came out of the ship，＇namely，barrels，b \＆c．Kuin．would supply dтoppøym\＆itas．










that ellipsis is too arbitrary, and is unnecessary.

XXVIII. 1. dтé $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma a \nu]$ " ascertained or recognized." Meגitn. It was an old opinion, strenuously supported, in the last century, by de Rhoer, that this is not the African Melita, but another, on the coast of Illyricum ; and thus of late revived, and ably defended by Mr. Bryant. But it is, after all, I conceive, untenable, as had long ago been proved by Scaliger, Bochart, Cluver., Cellar., \&c., and recently by every eminent Foreign Commentator. It doubtless arose from a mistake as to Adria above mentioned.
2. ol de $\left.\beta \alpha^{\prime} \rho \beta a \rho o l\right]$ The pride of the Greeks (and afterwards of the Romans) accounted men of all other nations harbarians. The not being able to speak the languages of those countries involved the charge of barbarism: and indeed that is by many supposed to be the primitive sense of the word. See the Note on Rom. i. 14. But it seems rather to have an Oriental origin; though not from the Arabic berber, to murmur, but from the Punic berber, a shepherd. Now it was originally appropriatel to the indigenous and pastoral inhabitants of Africa, who, to their more civilized fellow-men on the other side of the Mediterranean, appeared barbarians. Hence
 rustic or cloven. Here, however, the term is correctly applied, since (as Cluver. has shown) the inhabitants of this island were chiefly of Carthaginian origin.

- oi Tijv tux. $\phi i \lambda \alpha \nu \theta$.] ' no common benevolence, or kindness.' An elegant litotes. This use of ou with tux. is found in the best writers. Arduqurer Tupay. The best Commentators are agreed, that this signifies 'having set fire to 2 pyre [of wood];' a signification found both in the LXX. and the Classical writers. The common reading 'lighting a fire' would require $\pi \bar{v} \rho$. Прorè ${ }^{\prime}$ ßovto, ' took us into their protection and care. 'Bфестїтa. Not present, but rather violont, pelting, qui ingruerat, as Grot. renders. So Polyb. p. 1063 . cited by Wets., घ̈ate dta



3. ovorpéquvros] 'when he had heaped together.' There is something graphic in the term. Wets. compares Hesych. oi yvadeis
 is meant dry brush-wood, fit for fuel. So Xenoph.
 $\pi \bar{v} \rho$.
 'out of the heat.' But the best Interpreters, antient and modern, are agreed that the sense is 'pre calorem,' 'urged by the heat.' To take $\theta$ © $\rho \mu \mu \mathrm{y}$ for $\boldsymbol{x} v \rho$ ds would be unprecedented. 'Ex
廿ato, by a common Hellenistic idiom. Many eminent Commentators and Critics, indeed, maintain that it is not said the viper bit Paul; and that ка日 $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \pi$ тeто, even were that written. could not have such a sense. I have, however, in Recens. Synop. shown that this position is untenable. Among other passages which I have
 'laid hold on me,' (as we say ) tanned my skin. Upon the whole, it is undeniable that $\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha} \boldsymbol{\alpha} \boldsymbol{r} e c t a t$ signifies to lay fast hold of, fasten on. But this, when used of a serpent, necessarily implies biting. As to the argument from the words ei $\alpha \theta \in \mathrm{e}$ ovidiv кaк $\delta \nu$ at $v .5$., it is exceedingly weak; for even in a Classical writer, the position of the clause, and the air of the narration, would exclude any such sense as that "the reptile had not hurt Paul." But in a Hellenistic writer the popular sense, which may be denoted by the words, namely, that " no harm came of it," must be preferred. Besides, such is so evidently the opinion of St. Luke, (whom we cannot suppose to have been mistaken) that no other sense is tenable than the common one. Besides, how, it may be asked, can a serpent hang by any part of a man's body (as at v. 4.) but by his teeth.
4. Td Onpiov] The word is used not of beasts, properly so called, but of serpents. It primarily means any wild creature. So the Latin ferus comes from the same source; and Galen uses the worl Theria to denote medicines to cure the bite of a serpent.

- фoveís dot!-ciacev] The words are to be taken in their plain and popular sense, and such refinements as those of Elsn., Heins., and others, are not to be thought of. More may be urged in favour of the opinion of Camer., Bochart, Wets., Markl., Pearce, Kuin., and Schleus., that by in dixy is meant the Goddess of Justice; of which the Commentators adduce numerous examples: on account of which, we may at least, as the middle course, admit, with Bp. Middl., that dixn is here personifed. But this rhetorical personification falls far short of making a goddess













of a virtue. The people seem to have meant to reason thus: "Die he surely will; and no doubt for some crime worthy of death; and considering that he has been thus rescued from the jaws of a watery grave, and brought here to suffer death, surely he must have been guilty of the greatest of crimes, murder.' From the passages of the Classical writers adduced by Grot. Price., and Wets., it appears that the antients thought Divine justice sometimes delivered criminals out of dangers, in order to reserve them for heavier calamities, and severer punishments. Oín cia$\sigma \epsilon \nu$, 'has not suffered to live;' considering him as already dead; which proves that they must have been very sure the serpent had bitten Paul.

6. $\pi i \mu \pi \rho a \sigma \theta a t, \hat{\eta}$ nat. \&c.] Here are accurately represented the two classes of symptoms which supervene on the bite of a poisonous serpent, according to the virulence of the poison, and the strength of the body to which it is communicated. The first represents the swelling, and inflammation, in the beginning local, then general, which brings on a burning fever that quickly destroys the patient. The second is the effect of the strongest poison on the weakest body; on which subject we have lately derived much information from that enterprising explorer of nature in her wildest tracks, Mr. Whaterton, in his accurate experiments on the effect of the Worali poison on various subjects, as recorded in his "Wanderings."
 is Hellenistic in its manner, and corresponds to
 the common interpretation of that expression. "A consol is not unfrequent in the best writers in the sense cuil. It here denotes producing harm to the body, in which sense it is often used in the hest writers, especially the Medical ones.

- Ecol ] The Commentators are perhaps needlessly minute in debating what (iod; for the question is undeterminable; and, after all, the word might be used in that lower sense (to denote a Divine person) which is occasionally found in the later writers, especially Philostratus in his life of Apollonius, who, I suspect, has so used it in order to do that at which Heterodox Theologins so anxiously aim, namely, to make out

O coss, as used of Jesus Christ, mean no more that a divine person, i.e. something above man, bu below God.
7. Xcopia] estates. See Note on Matt. xx 36. To $\boldsymbol{\pi} \dot{\omega} \tau \omega$. This may be interpreted, w! most Commentators, 'the principal person of in island ${ }^{*}$ a sense frequent in the N. T. As, hows ever, the term is often found in Inscriptions as Coins, even of Malta, used in the sense Govern... Grot., Bochart, and also the best recent (0) mentators are, with reason, of opinion that: signifies the Prefect of the island.
 house kindly entertained us.' 'Avar. is used $\dot{v}$ oo d. let one example of this use is addu4 by Wets. from Allan. Eevi乌cu and $\phi \boldsymbol{\lambda}$. usual terms on this subject.
8. tupetrois- necessity for Dr. Owen to have conject 1 $\pi v \rho \in \tau \bar{\omega}$, since of the plural in a singular examples are adduced by Munthe, as ala fehres in the Latin from Amman by Wets. several might be added from Hippocrates. hap the plural may be used with reference: those fits, or paroxysms, by which fever $m$ its attacks. And possibly the Ө́́ppas ioxupl Thucyd. ii. 49. may be interpreted on the principle. EuvéXertat is a vow sol. de hat $r$ which see Note on Mark i. 30. On oi ex riateveias, see Lu. xxiv. 11. sq.
 of the best Commentators are of opinion, $\tau$ tais is here to be taken in a sense frequ. the Classical writers, and not unknown Scriptures, to denote honorary rewards. following examples may suffice. Ecclus. av

 $\delta \iota \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} s \tau \iota \mu \bar{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \xi_{\imath} \sigma \dot{\sigma} \theta \infty \sigma a \nu$. the former of passages was probably in the mind of $s t$. The sense seems to be 'honorary presents.' however, of money, (which Paul probably y refuse) but of necessaries. The words for l seem meant to give an example of the
 plained by Wets. 'onerarunt nos, et cu ingesserunt, et nee petentibus imposut and he refers to Ruth iii. 15. At $\tau$ xpciav sub. divíкоvтa.













 onpuv, or insigne, was that from which the -hip derived its name. It was a painting, or basrelief on the prow, of some god or hero, or sometimes animal: nay, even inanimate subistance, as shield se. So Ovid Triit. i. 10, 1. Eit mihi, sitque precor, flava tutela Ninerva, Navis; et a picta casside nomen habet. Virg. En. v. 115. seqq. The ponp bore the picture, or image of some goi, under whose protection the ship was supposed to be placed. Hoth the tutelat and the insigne were of gold, (or rather gilded metal) ivory, or other rich material. So Virg. An. x. 171. Ft aurato fulgebat A polline puppis. Thus of the ship mentioned in the above cited pasiage of Ovid the numen tutelare was Minerta, placed on the poop; but the insigne, or жарáбŋиov, was a helmet of Minerva painted on the prow : and this gare name to the ship. Yet such was not the invariable custom. Sometimes the futela and the rapáaimon were the same; as, for instance, whenever the effigies of the Deity himself, to whose protection the ship was committed, supplied the place of an insigne; (which often happened) then the ship was called by the name of that God who was painted or carved on the prow. Thus the Alexandrian ship in which Paul sailed had the Dioscuri for an insigne as well as a tutela; whence, too, it was called $\Delta \iota o ́ \sigma \kappa o v \rho o t$. It is scarcely necessary to observe, that the Dioscuri had, in the heathen mythology, the expecial province of succouring persons in danger of shipwreck.
 a great measure for Commercial purposes.
13. सepte入Өóvтes] Not 'fetching a compass,' but ' coasting about,' as most Translators render; with reference, 1 imagine, to the promontories, especially that of Taurus, to be doubled in coasting the Sicilian shore; for, in the former sense, the term would not be justified by geographical truth, unless, indeed, it were to be understood of taking a course, by reason of a Westerly wind, very much to the East, and so getting to Rhegium by tacking. And from the etrarevopévou vórov in the next verse it is certain that the wind had shifted, and was not the same. But if 80 , they could not coast along Sicily.

- $\dot{d} \pi / \gamma$. vórov] 'the South wind having arisen.' Of this idiom examples are given by

Weta. and Munthe. On the idiom in deutepuiou, see Note at Joh. xi. 39. They were now in the regular track of vessels from Alexandria to Rome, as Wolf infers from Suet. Vesh. C. 5.
14. Tapeniㄱit $\left.\eta \mu \eta \nu-\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \alpha^{\prime}\right]$ 'we were entreated to stay seven days.' It is probable that they had arrived there on the day after the Lord's day. Hence they were requested to stay the nest Lord's day over, to give an opportunity to all the Christians of hearing Paul's preaching. See Note on Gal. i. 18.
15. єкєiӨen-iкоúgantes] ' having heard from thence,' viz. from Putcoli, either by letter, or by me-sage. No doubt there was a constant communication between the two places. Eis $\boldsymbol{a} \pi \boldsymbol{x} \boldsymbol{a}$ iмiv axpis 'A. The distance ( 51 miles) marks the profound respect paid to l'aul by the Roman Christians.
 have been inns, for the refreshment of travellers passing to and from Rome; but they were probably rather retuil shops for the sale of all sorts of eatables and drinkables. Thus Zosimus ii. 10. calls them the тpıa катŋ入єia: and indeed this was the usual sense of taberna, which word Donatus well derives from Trabena, such being at first wooden houses for shops only. Thus it is used by Horace of a Bowkseller's shop, and also of a uine-shop.
16. тарє́дெхке \&c.] It was ordered by law that all those sent as prisoners to Rome should be delivered to the custody of the Prafectus Pratorii, and guarded in the Pretorian camp. Here St. Luke has expressed himself with extreme brevity; but his meaning seems to be this: -The Centurion delivered his prisoners to the charge of the Prefect [by, whom] it was permitted to Paul' \&c. Kat' $\dot{\text { en }}$, from the other prisoners,' who were confined in the carcer castrense. A great favour this ; for even those to whom the lihera custodia, or $\phi \cup \lambda a \times r \dot{\prime}$ aiठ́couos, was granted, were yet usually confined in a part of the public prison, called the deन. цштиpor è $\lambda$ everiptov. So in Philostr. V. A. vii.
 pioy.

- $\sigma \dot{v} v \tau \bar{\varphi} \phi u \lambda_{\text {. }}$ a. $\sigma$.] And, as appeass from v. 20., and according to the invariable custom of persons kept in such sort of durance, chained by the hand to the soldier. Nay, from Joeeph.
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p．814．7．we find that even King Agrippa，when in confinement at Rome，was chained to a sol－ diet．

17．Toùs ôytas трю́tous］C．Vitringa takes these to have been the Rulers of the Synagogue． But Wolf and Krebs，with more probability， think they were the principal persons of the Jews．
－morions］＇though 1 had done；＇，a some－ what unusual sense of the participle．＇Evavrion must be accommodated in sense to the two clauses to which it belongs，namely，＇nothing injurious to the Jewish people，or at variance with the customs＇\＆c．At＇Ípoorod．Grot．and Kuin． suppose an slip．of $\alpha \pi a \chi \theta e i s$ ，as at vii．9．Td


19．out cis－кarฑうop $\bar{\eta} \sigma \alpha$ ］Literally，＇not as having aught to accuse my own nation of，＇i．e． not intending thereby to accuse，as Markl．has seen．

20．Evened jap］The rap refers to a clause omitted；q．d．［And I may justly claim to be free from all offence to my nation，nay，even to be attached to it ］for，for the hope of Israel（i．e． the long expected Messiah）\＆c．See Note at


21，22．The latter of these two verses shows that the former must，in interpretation，be quali－
feed，and the sense contained in both may be $\tau$ expressed：＇We have neither receivedisany tens from Judea［containing any badfaccoun thee］nor have any of the brethren come $t$ and related or spoken aught of evil concert thee．But we wish to hear from thee what 1 thickest，or hast to say，concerning this ［viz．in its justification］；for it has come tc knowledge that it is every where spoken There is something obscure and incoherer the wording，which may partly be ascribe the delicacy of the speakers．They say have heard no evil of him，because they di regard his professing Christianity as inv any thing movypdy，such rather regarding a than opinions．＇A $\varepsilon$ Loüucu－фpovezs is an d． way of asking what he has to say in defer Christianity，which they well understood
 ＇I $\sigma \rho a \dot{j} \lambda$ ．
23．тaそáцє vol \＆c．］＇having appointe． as the sense rather seems to be，having with him for；＇on which signification word，see my Note on Thucyd．i． 99. ones，＇a good many．＇＇EE्रeriӨero scat earnestly set forth．＇See xviii．20．II cit tours ta＇$\pi \in \rho$ \＆\＆c．An unusual syntax of on which see Win．Gr．Gr．















[^20]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ How can we fail to lament that while we see Fritzche acknowledging freely the sense which the immutable laws of Verbal Criticism compel us to assign to Scripture, we should also see him caught in the toils of that miserable sophistry which entangles the ordinary and half learned sciolists and sceptics of his country !

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ The same want had been before perceived by the acute and learned Winer, as may be seen in his Oratio de Emendandà interpretatione Nov. Test. Lips. 1823. 8vo, and in his prefact to an useful Edition of the Epistle to the Galatians, intended to be a specimen of what he thought was proper to be done on the whole of the New Testament.
    ${ }^{3}$ See "Remarks on Clerical Education," by the Rev. H. Raikes, in which is contained an admirable Chapter on Helps in the Interpretation of Scripture, wherein is satisfactorily evinced the necessity of raising the standard of Biblical Study.

[^2]:    Mr. 4 In joustification of them, 'il has generally been urged, that the words, phrases, ar cilume sof thapne out are glossematical, and therefore apurious. On this point, however, the present Editor is entirely at issue with the Oriesbachian School; and he has much pleasure in
     pacter anpeatigandia, at $\mathfrak{p}$. 501. aqqu of his Opusc. Theolog: Lips. 1803., as also an able and jnstructive Dissertation of Bornemann de Glossematis N. T. cautè dijudicandis, Lips. 1830., Who thiefe completely refutes the rash assertions of Wrassenbergh in a Dissertation de Grioule ajpunded to Valck. Scholia ad N. T. and ably diatribates chene prepended qlapee uhdar five Classee.

    Thus it is well observed by the profoundy learned Valkerieet in tiss Schol. in N. '中.
     retur; nedum talia tentare licet in Sacris, ubi Critica exercenda sobria et modeăta, ut \& supffstitione quidem libera, sic tamen multo magis a temeritaite.".

[^3]:    6 In this department of his labours the Editor has availed himself of the valuable assistance (though that not unfrequently failed him) of Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius, and Theodoret ; Grotius, Crellius, Carpzov, Koppe, Pott, Heinrichs, Kuinoel, and others of the more recent Foreign Commentators ; as also, of our own divines, Hammond, Whitby, Locke, Peirce, Benson, Doddridge, Chandler, and finally Mr. Scott, to the various merits and general excellence of whose elaborate Commentary the Editor (widely as he differs from that pious writer on certain points of doctrine, and others of doubtful disputation) bears most decided testimony.

[^4]:    11111
    ${ }^{7}$ Thus it is profeundly observed by the illustrious Bacon, Nov. Ong. no 56. "Reper; riuntur ingenia alia in admirationem Antiquitatis, alia in amorem et amplexum Novitatis efficidy' patida vero cijus temperamenti sant, ut modum tenere possint, quin aut que recte positarsunt ab Antiquis convellant, aut es contemnsat ques recte afferantur a Novis ' Hap: vero magno scientiarum et Philosophiæ detrimento fit, quum studia potius sint Antiquitatis et 'Wóvitatis, quain judicia: Veritas autem non a felicitate temporis alicajus, qué res varia est ; sed a lumine Nature et Experientiz, quod zternum est, petenda est." See also Lord Clareadon's sulminatle Essay on the Degree of Reverence due to Antiquity.
    ${ }^{3}$ See the excellent Dissertation of Tittmann de Simplicitate in interpretatione N. T. and another de causis contortarum Interpret. N. T. p. 239 281. de Synon. N. T.

[^5]:    ${ }^{10}$ See the Dissertation of the same writer, "de Scriptorum N. T. diligentia Grammatica rectè astimanda."
    ${ }^{11}$ The difficulties of Scripture, as they must not be underrated, so neither are they to be magnified beyond due bounds. "From either extreme," says the learned Bp. Van Mildert, in his Bampt. Lect. p. 217. (a work, like Bp. Marsh's Lectures, invaluable to Students, "evil consequences may arise; from the one, carelessness or presumption, from the other, blind submission to spiritual guides, or a morbid indisposition to rational inquiry. In either case, encouragement will be given to the dissemination of error ; and Romanism, on the one hand, or Fanaticism, on the other, may be favoured, and the priviloge of using the Word may be arrogantly monopolized by the Ministers, or irreverently assumed by such as are wholly destitute of the acquirements necessary for the Interpreter."
    ${ }^{12}$ Thus it is justly observed by the learned Tittmann, "Tirones hodie discunt ac norunt, que doctissimi olim viri vix mente divinarunt." This is especially the case with reapect to the Greek Article, Greek Syntax, Etymology, and the nature of language in general.

[^6]:    - iкрá $\tau \eta \sigma \alpha \nu]$ seized him.

    51. dixéracre.] This is Hellenistic Greek for foxace, or d $\sigma \pi \dot{\alpha} \sigma a \tau 0$, and occurs elsewhere only
[^7]:    has been a needless scruple raised, the best way of avoiding which is to consider them as expressing this sense : 'do not go into the village and tell them what has happened.' T $\nu \nu$ l èv $\tau \bar{\eta} \kappa \omega^{\prime} \mu!\eta$. A periphrasis for 'the villagers.' The man was, it seems, not of Bethsaida.
    31. बंжоסок! $\mu \sigma^{\circ} \bar{\eta} \nu a t$ ] An allusion to Ps. exviii. 22. And the word implies contumely with rejection.
    32. $\pi a \dot{\rho} \dot{\rho} \eta \sigma i q]$ i. e. 'plainly.' So Euthym.

[^8]:    13. $d \gamma \rho \in \dot{0} \sigma \infty \sigma t]$ This verb, like the Heb. properly signifies to make spoil of, catch, take, as said of beasts, birds, and fishes ; but as this implies circumvention, so it metaphorically denotes to lay snares for any one, either by words or deeds, and may then be rendered to ensnare. Matth. uses the more special expression may-
    
[^9]:    19. $\Phi_{C} \lambda_{\text {imтov }}$ This is omitted in very many MSS., and almost all the early Editions, and has been with reason cancelled by almost every Editor from Wets. to Scholz.
     words have occasioned much perplexity, not only to modern Commentators, but, (as appears from the Varr. Lectt.) to the antient Interpreters. The phraseology is rugged and awkward; yet the difficulty must not be removed by cancelling any word, (for the consent of MSS. will not permit that), nor even by silencing it. Some seek to remove the difficulty by connecting env with d $\rho X$. But this is doing violence to the construction, and yields a feeble and frigid sense. Upon the whole, 1 am still of opinion, that no interpretation involves so little difficulty as that of the antients and most early moderns, (which has been adopted, too, by some eminent recent Commentators), by which $\eta^{j} y$ is to be construed with $\alpha \rho X$., and civas understood after $\alpha \rho X$. The
[^10]:    46. кaleite] The word has here a sensus prægnans, and signifies, 'Why do you address me, saying Lord.
    47. Érкa母e кal $\dot{\beta} \beta^{\prime} \theta_{\nu \nu \epsilon] ~ b y ~ H e n d i a d y s, ~ f o r ~}^{\text {a }}$ $\beta a \theta$ écos ế $\sigma \kappa \alpha \psi \epsilon$; a kind of expression found both in the Classical and the Hellenistical writers. So
     б́ठ $\rho a \mu \epsilon$. See Winer's Gr. Gr. \$47.3. The moral (as Grot. observes) is, that the study of piety should not be superficial, but a principle well grounded and deeply rooted in the heart, so as to resist the assaults of passion, temptation, \&ec.

    - $\pi \lambda \eta \mu \mu \dot{\prime} \rho a s]$ The word denotes a swell or inundation of any kind.
    VII. 2. ös ịv aùtệ durıuus] ' who was much esteemed by him.' Of this signification examples are adduced by Wets.

[^11]:    7. eire $\lambda$ óce] ] give thy fiat at a word,' or by word of mouth.
    8. ḋaúpacev] held him in admiration, wondered at his message. This use of $\theta a v \mu a ́ \zeta c u v$ is somewhat rare.
    9. ixayol] bene multi.
     term like the Latin efferre; for the custom of interring the dead a little outside of cities or towns was common to all the antients; to the Jews, because dead bodies were among them unclean; and to the Gentiles, to prevent infection. Grot.

    In re日vinais we have a Participle for Adjective, dead.

    - $\tau \bar{\eta} \mu \eta T \rho l]$ Dative of possession for the Genit., as Matth. ii. 18. and not unfrequently in the Scriptural and also Classical writers. See Math. Gr. Gr. $§ 392.3$ and Winer's Gr. Gr. $\$ 25$. 6. Note 3. One cannot but remark the simple pathos of the story, with which I have in Recens. Synop. compared Eurip. Alc. 305.
    
    

    At кal aüri X $\quad$ ípa there is something like an Anantapodoton. Some MSS., indeed, have auंTp̄ xrípa. But that is evidently a mere emendation, and indeed unnecessary; for we have only to supply $\dot{\eta} \nu$, agreeably to the tense of the pre-
    ceding verb, and in some measure anticipated from the following $\dot{\eta} \nu$; for a repetition of $\bar{\eta} \nu$ within so short a space would have been offensive. The $\bar{\eta} \nu$ just after is, indeed, omitted in many MSS., early Edd. and Versions. And it is cancelled by almost all the Editors. Yet it cannot be dispensed with. I suspect that its omission partly arose from a mistake originating in a confounding of this $\dot{\eta} \nu$ with the one just before. The MSS. in which it is not found are comparatively few : and the Versions can have no weight, since those which here omit the $\bar{\eta} \boldsymbol{y}$ insert it just before, and they could not well express it in both places.
    14. $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \psi a \tau o ~ \tau \bar{\eta} \mathrm{~s}$ oopoū] Meaning thereby to stop the bearers. इcopos generally denotes a coffin, of marble or other materials. But as such were not used by the Jews. The word must here denote the bier, or funeral couch on which the dead of the higher classes were carried forth. See the references in Recens. Synop. and my Note on Thucyd. ii. 34.
    16. фoßos] 'awe.'
     the Commentators take $\dot{\varepsilon} y$ for dia. But that is so harsh that it is better to suppose \&\% used for cls, (as often) in the sense unto, which implies over and throughout.

[^12]:    many MSS．and Versions，and is adopted by almost every Editor from Wets．to Scholz．，being the more difficult reading；whereas the other seems to be derived from Matth．and Mark．Els occurs again in this sense infra xiv． 9 ．

    9．Tis elף $\eta$ ท $\pi a \rho a \beta o \lambda \eta{ }_{\eta} \pi$ ．］i．ea what might be the meaning of this parable．See Winer＇s Gr． Gr． 6 35．3．So Cebes Tab．$\delta \iota \eta \eta_{\eta} \sigma a \iota \dot{\eta} \mu і \nu — \tau i$
    
    
     explained＇in their progress through life，＇＇as they proceed in life．＇So Euthym．тo入ıtevórevot． See Luke i．6．In ixd $\mu \in \rho \iota \mu \nu \dot{\omega} \nu$ the sense， which is imperfectly developed，seems to be，＇by the cares of poverty and the anziety of riches，and by the amusements and pleasures of life．＇The two first are illustrated by passages of Theocrit．Idyl． xxi．and Eurip．Med．599．adduced in Recens． Synop．；and the third by Demosth．cited in
    
    －ov่ тe入єaфopov̂ซt］The word is used of trees or plants bringing fruit to maturity，almost atways with an Accus．

[^13]:    the verb，or ind supplied，together with aitaiy referring to $\delta \chi \lambda o v$ ，which is a noun of multitude． ＇Ibeiv is for $\sigma u y$ ruxeiv，i．e．$\lambda a \lambda \bar{\eta} \sigma a l$ ，as in Math．（antecedent for consequent）．So in Thucyd．iv．125．and Yen．Cyr．iv．6， 2 ．

    23．dф́́тveser］obdormivit．A rare sense， dфurvous and diфuxutco signifying in the Clos－ sical writers to raise oneself from sleep，to awake． The other occurs，however，in the LXX．（Judg． v．27．）in Ignat．Martyr．© 7．，and is noticed in the Glosearia Gr．Lat．Marki．thinks it was an Antiochism．But it rather seems to have been a popular use of the word．
    23．кaт $\beta^{\beta} \eta$ ］Stormy gusts are often denoted by катаßalyevv．So Thucyd．ii．25．dуíдov катiontos．et see．Plat．ap．Steph．Thee． Pusan．xi．34．3．катіоутоя І̀тı той тиеїцатоя Pollux i．103．катíoy cos тoù d̀érev．
    －бvverìnןoüvтe］A popular catachresis，by which what happens to the ship is ascribed to

[^14]:    XIX．1．ס九iрхєтo］Campb．and Wakef． render＇was passing through ；＇rightly，I con－ ceive．
     agreed that this signifies a chief tax gatherer，a sort of receiver－general of a district，in which several publicans，who were inferior collectors， were employed．That Zacchæus was a Jew，and not，as some imagine，a Gentile，is pretty cer－ tain from ver．9．The occurrence of ourros after aútós may seem harsh，but examples from the Classics are adduced by Bornem．The oũtos

[^15]:    has somewhat of emphasis，and as many render， ＂And the man was rich．＂

    3．＇乡＇ท่тєt－Tis $\dot{\sigma} \sigma t \downarrow$ On this idiom，see Vig． and Matth．Gr．Gr．§ 295.3 ．Tis signifies qualis， what sort of person．The use of $\dot{\boldsymbol{\alpha} \pi \boldsymbol{\delta} \text { before tov }}$ $\boldsymbol{o} \chi \lambda o v$ is Hellenistic，and formed on the Hebr．$D$ ， on account of．

    4．тродрацш̀ $\bar{\epsilon} \mu \pi$ ．」 The Commentators ad－ duce similar pleonasms from the Classical wri－ ters．Yet it may be doubted whether there is ever，strictly speaking，a pleonasm at all．There is almost always a strengthening of the sense．

[^16]:    66. Td $\pi \rho \in \sigma \beta$. тoū $\lambda a 0$ oi] Luke alone in this passage and Acts $\times x i i .5$. gives this name to the Sanhedrim. He also at Acts v. 21. calls it $\eta \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ povoia.
     phrases thus: ' If I simply tell you that I am the Messiah, you will not believe me.' If 1 propose questions to you by which I may show you, that I am the Messiah (See xx.3. seqq.) you will not answer me, nor, though convinced by the weight of my arguments, interrogations, and proofs, will you release me; nevertheless I' plainly declare, that from this time I shall sit at the right hand of God.' The Hebrews, it may be observed, were accustomed to accompany and follow up argusments with interrogations.
    XXIII. I. $\tau \delta \pi \lambda \bar{\eta} \theta o s, \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \bar{v}]$ i.e. the chief priests and elders, with their servants and other
[^17]:    VI．On v．1－14．see Matth．xiv．13－21．and Notes．
    9．Taidajiov］a youth，between boyhood and manhood．This was probably a baker＇s servant，who had been sent to dispose of bread in a place where，from the great multitude collected， it was likely to obtain a ready sale．
    10．ウ̀v dè Xópтos－Tóste］A And thus it would be very suitable for the purpose．On these inci－ lental and parenthetical circumstances，which
    mark an eye－witness，see my Note on Thucyd． iv．13．No． 5 ．
    14．On the difference between this miracle and those of Moses see Chrys．，Girot．，Lampe，and Rosenm．in Recens．Synop．
    16－19］See Notes on Matt．xiv．22．sq．and Mark vi．46．seqq．

    18．$\delta \iota \eta \gamma \in i \rho \in \tau 0]$ Lampe adduces Pollux i． 9 ．
    

    19．غ̇ضクaкótєs］Neuter verbe，as d入aúva，

[^18]:     thing strange in these persons，under the impulse of the Spirit，bidding Paul not to go to Jerusa－ lem，when it was doubtless the will of God that he should go．To remove this difficulty，many Commentators take dıa roü тиеúm．to mean ＇ex proprio spiritu．＇Such a phraseology，how－ ever，would be unprecedented．let more ob－ jectionable is the solution of the recent foreign Commentators．See Recens．Synop．The ex－ pression must retain its force，and be rendered， ＇under the influence of the Holy Spirit．＇The difticulty，however，which that involves will be
     sense common in all the beit writern，e．gr． Thucyd．vi．29．Eौerov－$\pi \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ ．Besides，the words being used papulariter，may be understood as limited by some clause omitted，and thus the sense will be，＇they counselled him not［if he valued his safety］to go to Jerusalem．＂The Spirit did not order them to bid him not go，but only enabled them to predict，that there would be danger in his going．

    5．¿Ĕupriбat］＇had completed．＇This use of
     lenistic．
     valedictory embraces：＇
    －cis ra ijıal Nee Joh．xvi．2．and Note． Td rioũov，i．e．the ship by which they had sailed from l＇atara to Tyre．

    7．Tóv $\pi \lambda_{0 u ̈} \dot{d i c a v .] ~ T h e ~ o n l y ~ m o d e ~ o f ~ r e-~}$ moving the difficulty involved in this expression is（with Markland and Kuin．）to take the Aorist as put for a Present，and render thus accom－ plishing our royagr，i．e．the sailing part of our journey．

[^19]:    30. каі таüта eixóvtos aùtoü] These v
[^20]:     I would compare Soph. Aj. 85. where Minerva de д̇орко́та.

